# REPORT RESUMES

ED 002 998 24

CHANGES IN SCHOOLS WHICH DO AND DO NOT SEND STAFF MEMBERS TO TRAINING INSTITUTES IN COUNSELING.

BY- RUNKEL, PHILIP J. AND OTHERS

ILLINOIS UNIV., URBANA, BUR. OF EDUC. RESEARCH

REPORT NUMBER CRP-939 PUB DATE 61

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.27 HC-$5.48 137P.

DESCRIPTORS- *SCHOOL PERSONNEL, HIGH SCHOOLS, *TESTING PROGRAMS, *COUNSELING PROGRAMS, COUNSELOR TRAINING, TEST RESULTS, *TEACHER ATTITUDES, *TEACHER EDUCATION, URBANA, ILLINOIS

DATA DERIVED FROM THREE STUDIES WERE USED IN ANALYSES OF (1) SELECTED SECONDARY SCHOOL TEST PRACTICES AND ATTITUDES AND (2) THE RELATIVE EFFECTIVENESS OF TRAINING RECEIVED IN SUMMER GUIDANCE INSTITUTES FOR TEACHERS AND COUNSELORS. TWO OF THE THREE STUDIES WERE PREVIOUS COOPERATIVE RESEARCH PROJECTS--CRP 509, "THE USE OF TEST RESULTS," AND CRP 702, "EFFECTS ON THE USE OF TESTS BY TEACHERS TRAINED IN A SUMMER INSTITUTE." THE THIRD STUDY (THE PRESENT ONE) DEALS WITH 50 ILLINOIS SCHOOLS WHICH DID NOT SEND PERSONNEL TO THE ILLINOIS SUMMER INSTITUTE OF 1959. HIGH SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS, GUIDANCE COUNSELORS, AND TEACHERS IN THIS HYPOTHETICAL GROUP BECAME A CONTROL IN WHICH TESTING ATTITUDES AND PRACTICES WERE COMPARED TO THE TWO PREVIOUS STUDIES. IMPLICATIONS WERE THAT ATTEMPTS TO INFLUENCE TESTING AND COUNSELING ATTITUDES AND PRACTICES IN SECONDARY SCHOOLS COULD BE POSITIVELY AFFECTED BY (1) INTENSIVE FACULTY FAMILIARIZATION PROGRAMS AND (2) MORE EFFECTIVE PREPARATION AND INDOCTRINATION OF FACULTY MEMBERS WHO ATTEMPT TO INSTITUTE EDUCATIONAL CHANGE. (JH)

939

OFFICIAL RESEARCH FILE COPY

# CHANGES IN SCHOOLS WHICH DO AND DO NOT SEND STAFF MEMBERS TO TRAINING INSTITUTES IN COUNSELING

*Cooperative Research Project No. 939*

PHILIP J. RUNKEL, J. THOMAS HASTINGS, AND DORA E. DAMRIN

BUREAU OF EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH · COLLEGE OF EDUCATION · UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS · URBANA

Official File Copy

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE
Office of Education
This document has been reproduced exactly as received from the person or organization originating it. Points of view or opinions stated do not necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

# CHANGES IN SCHOOLS WHICH DO AND DO NOT SEND STAFF MEMBERS TO TRAINING INSTITUTES IN COUNSELING

Cooperative Research Project No. 939

Philip J. Runkel, Chief Investigator
J. Thomas Hastings, Associate Investigator
Dora E. Damrin, Research Associate

with the assistance of

Gerald L. Larson
Donald G. Beane

A supplementary study to
Cooperative Research Projects No. 509 and 702

Bureau of Educational Research
University of Illinois
Urbana, Illinois

1961

The research reported herein was performed pursuant
to a contract with the United States Office of Education,
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

ED002998

# CONTENTS

Chapter I: INTRODUCTION . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 1

The samples . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 2
Instrumentation . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 5
Organization of the report . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 6

II: STABILITY AND REPRESENTATIVENESS: COMPARISONS OF THE SAMPLES ON SINGLE VARIABLES . . . . . . . . . . . . . 8

Stability of attitudes and practices . . . . . . . . . 10
Comparisons of all three samples . . . . . . . . . . . 14
Responses of teachers in the SI and CS samples . . . 15

III: STABILITY AND REPRESENTATIVENESS: COMPARISONS OF THE SAMPLES ON RELATIONS BETWEEN VARIABLES . . . . . . . 36

Comparisons of relations across samples . . . . . . . 36
Tests of differences between samples . . . . . . . . . 38

IV: EFFECTS OF INSTITUTES IN GUIDANCE AND TESTING . . . . . 62

Relations between frequency of institute training and other variables . . . . . . . . . . . 63
Relations between training at the Illinois institute and other variables . . . . . . . . . . . 65
Changes over a year's time in relations between training in institutes and other variables . . . . 69

V: COMPARISONS OF COUNSELORS, TEACHERS, AND ADMINISTRATORS . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 87

VI: SUMMARY . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 112

Appendix: Questionnaire for the CS study . . . . . . . . . follows 117

# CHAPTER I

## INTRODUCTION

This report is not meant to stand alone. It supplements the reports on Projects 509* and 702.** Project 509 was a first inquiry, by means of a mailed questionnaire, into teachers' use of information about students in public high schools of Illinois. Its central aim was to investigate some correlates of existing test use on the part of teachers, counselors, and administrators. Project 702 focused upon the effects of training on the use of test results; the source of trained subjects chosen for study was a summer institute in counseling held at the University of Illinois in 1959. Project 702 investigated the impact of training in this institute upon certain counseling attitudes and practices -- including the use of test results -- on the part of (1) individuals who were participants in the institute and on the part of (2) the faculties of the schools to which the individuals returned. Although the schools to which the institute trainees returned were not a random sample of secondary schools in Illinois, they covered a wide range on each of a number of important variables.

Some of the questions asked of respondents in Project 509 were also used in Project 702. As well as using questionnaire items, certain more elaborate measurement procedures were tried out in Project 509 and refined for further use in Project 702. Since both projects had teachers, counselors, and principals as subjects and since both shared certain measures, it seemed likely that more could be learned if the results of the two were compared. However, some difficulties arose. The schools in Project 702 were chosen precisely because each school sent a participant to the Summer Institute in Guidance in 1959, and much of the analysis of the data subsequently obtained focused upon schools as units rather than individuals as units. In Project 509, schools were included randomly from all over the state without regard to whether they had sent members to institutes in counseling. Furthermore, the number of individuals sampled within each school in Project 509 was comparatively small; the analysis focused upon categories of individuals and not upon characteristics of faculties as units.

---

*The Use of Test Results: Cooperative Research Project No. 509.

**Effects on Use of Tests by Teachers Trained in a Summer Institute: Cooperative Research Project No. 702. Both these reports may be obtained from depository libraries cooperating in the Documents Expediting Project of the Library of Congress.

To illuminate the results of both the previous projects, it seemed good strategy to obtain a "control group" of schools against which the findings of the two earlier projects could be compared. This was the purpose of the present project. Sepcifically, the purposes of this project come under two main headings: (1) examining the stability of attitudes and reported practices between the spring of 1959 (Project 509) and the fall of 1960 (the present project) and (2) comparing some of the results from the schools non-randomly selected for Project 702 with results in the randomly selected sample of schools in the present project.

## The Samples

This report will refer to three samples taken from the three projects: Project 509, Project 702, and the present Project 939. Although a full description of the samples in the earlier projects can be found in the reports on those projects, a brief description of each will be given below.

### The Project 509 Sub-study A sample

Project 509 utilized three separate samples of subjects, but this report will deal only with the sample used in "Sub-Study A" of that project. This sample will hereafter be called the "SSA" sample.

The SSA data were obtained from public high schools in Illinois having 100 or more students -- a total of 591 schools. A questionnaire was sent to the principal of every school and to the guidance counselor or the head of guidance. In schools of 2500 or more students, questionnaires were sent to 15 teachers randomly selected; in smaller schools, questionnaires were sent to five randomly selected teachers. The sampling list for teachers was the latest Illinois School Directory. The questionnaires sent to principals, counselors, and teachers were identical except for minor changes in wording and an occasional question specific to the duties of the respondent.

The questionnaires were sent in a package to the principal of each school, who was asked to distribute them. Accordingly, potential respondents were not reached unless the principal did in fact distribute the questionnaires. The percentages of returns from among those we hoped the questionnaires would reach were as follows: from schools, 94 per cent; from principals, 89 per cent; from counselors, 88 per cent; and from teachers, 78 per cent. Based on those who actually received the questionnaires, the percentages of returns were: principals, 94 per cent; counselors, 93 per cent; and teachers, 83 per cent.

Comparisons of the responses of those who returned their questionnaires without having to be reminded with those who returned their questionnaires after receiving a follow-up letter showed almost no differences. This gave us some confidence that the small percentage of persons who did not reply would have answered in ways similar to those who did reply.

## The Summer Institute sample

The sample of Project 702 was not a random sample. The study was essentially a follow-up study of a summer institute in guidance held at the University of Illinois during the summer of 1959. At the close of the institute, 28 trainees went into (or returned to) counseling positions in as many secondary schools. The sample consisted of the 28 trainees and the bulk of the faculty members in their schools. Although this was not a random sampling of the state, the schools represented a broad range of characteristics. In regard to the particularly relevant variable of counseling facilities, they ranged from schools with large full-time counseling staffs to schools in which the summer institute participant was not only the single counselor but a part-time one at that. This sample will hereafter be called the "Summer Institute" or "SI" sample.

Every administrator and every counselor in these schools was invited to become a subject in the study. The participation of all teachers was sought in schools with 25 or fewer faculty; in larger schools about half the teachers were selected. The percentages of returns were about 80 in the fall of 1959 and about 70 in the fall of 1960.

## The Control Schools sample

The sample obtained under the present project, because it was designed to provide "control" data for the earlier studies, will be known as the "Control Schools" or "CS" sample. The CS sample was selected in such a manner that it could be used for comparisons with the SSA and the SI samples. First, it was selected randomly from the high schools of the state; second, the bulk of the faculty in each school was solicited in each case; and third, information was obtained about the amount of recent training in the fields of guidance and testing received through faculty attendance at institutes.

A random sample of 50 high schools was selected from the listing in the current Illinois School Directory. In the meantime, a post card had been sent to the principal of every high school in the state asking how many persons in his school had attended an institute in guidance, counseling, testing, and/or measurement during the period June 1959 to September 1960 (roughly the period covered by the SI study). When the returns were in, we found that the average number of persons who had attended institutes from the 50 sampled schools was almost identical with the average number in the state as a whole.

Data collection from the Control Schools was done entirely by mail, following closely the procedures used in the SSA study. Preliminary letters and then packages of questionnaires were sent to the principals of the schools. In the case of most schools, we requested that the entire faculty participate. In the case of two schools with 79 and 95 faculty members respectively, we asked for two-thirds of the teachers (randomly selected from the Illinois School Directory and listed for the principal); and in the case of three schools of more than 100 faculty members, we asked for one-half the teachers. In every case, all of the administrators and all counselors were solicited. The sizes of the CS faculties ranged from seven to 171.

The percentages of returns are given in Table I-1.* In 47 (or 94 per cent) of the 50 schools chosen for the sample, the principals distributed the questionnaires to the faculty. Of the 70 administrators in the 50 schools originally addressed, usable questionnaires eventually were received from 77 per cent. However, because three principals did not distribute our questionnaires, they reached only 61 of the 70 originally on the list. Of those administrators actually reached, the percentage of returns was 89. The remainder of the table is to be read similarly.

The composition of the samples in terms of teachers, counselors, and administrators is shown in Table I-2. In Table I-2 the proportions of teachers, counselors, and administrators should not be taken as estimates of the proportions of the population since the numbers of teachers (and sometimes the numbers of others) who were taken into the sample were limited arbitrarily in the design. Finally, it should be mentioned that the schools of the SI and CS samples were both subsamples of the schools in the SSA sample, but that the SI and CS schools did not overlap.

## Instrumentation

The questionnaire used in the present study constitutes the Appendix. This was the sole instrument except for the post card sent to principals which asked how many of the faculty members in their schools had attended an institute in guidance, counseling, testing, and/or measurement during the period June 1959 to September 1960.

Section II of the appended questionnaire was not used in the present study. All the items in the remaining sections of the questionnaire had been used in the SSA study or the SI study or both. Few items, however, overlapped all three samples. In each chapter of this report, items will be presented which were common to the samples being compared.

---

*Tables will be found at the end of each chapter.

## Organization of the Report

In Chapter II, we shall compare the three samples on a succession of single variables. Since the SSA and CS samples were random samples of the same population with good percentages of returns, the comparison of the distributions of the two samples on the selected variables should give evidence of the stability of the population on these variables. In addition to this, comparison of the SSA and the CS samples with the SI sample will provide a basis for judging the representativeness of the SI sample.

Chapter III will display relations between variables in the three samples. This will serve to ascertain whether the relations changed over time (SSA to CS) and also will serve to corroborate previous findings through comparisons with the same relations in the CS sample.

All SI schools were schools, of course, which had sent at least one person to at least one institute (the one at the University of Illinois) between June 1959 and September 1960. The CS sample, on the other hand, contained some schools which had sent persons to institutes during that period and some schools which had not. In assessing the summer institute held at the University of Illinois in the summer of 1959 -- the focus of the report on Project 702 -- the schools in the CS sample which sent no faculty member to an institute can serve as a control group for the SI sample. (This purpose of the present project is reflected in its title.) Comparisons of the SI sample with the CS sub-samples which did and did not send faculty members to institutes will be given in Chapter IV. Comparisons of these samples will be given both for individual variables and for relations between variables.

Chapters III and IV pay particular attention to relations between training variables and other variables, carrying forward an important emphasis of the earlier projects into the present report. Another area to which much attention was given in the earlier projects was the comparison of the responses of teachers, counselors, and principals to certain variables. Chapter V will contrast the responses of these three groups to certain variables in the three samples. Finally, Chapter VI will summarize the results of the study.

Table I-1. **Percent of questionnaire returns for the CS study.**

| Questionnaires sent to: | Number sent | Percent returned filled out | Number reached | Percent returned from those reached |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Schools | 50 | 94 | | |
| Administrators | 70 | 77 | 61 | 89 |
| Counselors | 37 | 86 | 33 | 97 |
| Teachers | 1103 | 77 | 973 | 87 |

107
1110

77
56
72
3,240

Table I-2. **Composition of samples. Figures for teachers, counselors, and administrators are percentages of the respective sample.**

| Samples | Teachers | Counselors | Administrators | Total | N | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | Individuals | Schools |
| SSA: Sub-study A of Project 509 | | | | | | |
| | 78.3 | 6.6 | 15.1 | 100 | 3473 | 523 |
| SI: Project 702 | | | | | | |
| | 71.6 | 11.6 | 16.8 | 100 | 786 | 28 |
| CS: Project 939 | | | | | | |
| | 90.8 | 3.4 | 5.8 | 100 | 931 | 47 |

## CHAPTER II

## STABILITY AND REPRESENTATIVENESS: COMPARISONS OF THE SAMPLES ON SINGLE VARIABLES

All measurements in the SSA study were made in the spring of 1959, and all measurements in the CS study were made in the fall of 1960. In the SI study, however, measurements were made at three times: the fall of 1959, the spring of 1960, and the fall of 1960. For brevity, data from the SI study gathered at these three times will be designated respectively as SI(1959), SI(spring), and SI(1960).

Not many items were common through the instrumentation of all three samples. Distributions of responses to those items which were common will be shown in this chapter. In addition to these, distributions of responses will be shown for certain items common to the SI and CS samples. The list of variables taken from the items common to all three samples, each variable preceded by the number of the questionnaire item (see Appendix) from which it was taken, is given below:

| Appendix | | |
|---|---|---|
| Section | Item | Variables common to all three samples |
| Cover | 3, 4 | General education. |
| I | 1 | Number of courses in testing. |
| I | 17 | Test attitude ABC: a three-choice attitude item in which choice "B" was intended as the moderate viewpoint and the other two more extreme. |
| I | 9 | Reported frequency of discussing test results with parents. |
| I | 12 | Reported frequency of discussing test results with students. |
| I | 2 | Should intelligence tests be administered in your school? |
| I | 2 | -- academic aptitude tests? |
| I | 2 | -- tests of achievement in subject fields? |
| I | 2 | -- tests of achievement in reading? |
| I | 2 | -- interest tests? |
| I | 2 | -- personality tests? |

The variables in the list above are in the order they appear in the pertinent tables of this chapter, as are the variables in the list below which are the variables which were common to the SI and the CS samples.

| Appendix | | |
|---|---|---|
| Section | Item | Variables common to SI and CS samples |
| I | 4 | Do you feel that the information which your school obtains and files about students is sufficient? |
| I | 6 | Test dissemination to teachers: should test scores be made available in an administrative office? |
| I | 6 | Test dissemination to teachers: should scores be kept in a particular office where an appointed person will discuss the results? |
| I | 6 | Test dissemination to teachers: should test results in descriptive form be given to the teacher for the teacher to keep? |
| I | 6 | Test dissemination to teachers: should group meetings be held? |
| I | 8 | Test dissemination to parents: should any parent who wishes obtain test results from the principal or the counselor, but not from the teacher? |
| I | 8 | Test dissemination to parents: should any parent who wishes receive test results in conference with any teacher? |
| I | 8 | Test dissemination to parents: should parents whose children present academic or disciplinary problems be called in for conferences, test results being used as a part of the conference materials? |
| I | 11 | Test dissemination to students: should teachers discuss test results with students at the teacher's discretion? |
| I | 11 | Test dissemination to students: should counselors discuss test results with students in individual planning conferences? |
| I | 11 | Test dissemination to students: should students meet in groupsto discuss the interpretation of test results with a counselor or experienced teacher? |
| I | 9,12, 16 | Test Discussion Score (TDS): weighted sum of the coded answers to these items. |
| I | 2,3 | Satisfaction with the kinds of tests administered by the school. |
| III | | Agreement with experts (the summer institute instructors) on which of 25 items of the Counselor's Role Checklist ought to be part of the counselor's duties. |
| I | 19 | Number of students referred for vocational counseling. |
| I | 19 | Number of students referred for educational counseling. |
| I | 19 | Number of students referred for counseling about college. |
| I | 19 | Number of students referred for counseling about academic problems. |
| I | 19 | Number of students referred for counseling about disciplinary problems. |

## Stability of Attitudes and Practices

Tables II-1 through 11 give the distributions of answers by teachers to the items common to all three samples.* Tables II-12 through 22 are the corresponding tables for counselors, and Tables II-23 through 33 are the tables for administrators. Although these tables present data for all three samples, the discussion of stability in this section will refer only to the SSA and CS samples. We turn first to the responses of teachers, tabulated in Tables II-1 through 11.

### Stability of responses of teachers in the SSA and CS samples

It will be recalled that the SSA and CS samples were designed as random samples and that both drew high rates of returns; to the extent that the two samples were accurate we can interpret differences between them as representing changes within the population of teachers in the public high schools of the state. With regard to the responses of teachers, every table (II-1 through 11) shows a difference between the two samples. For ease of reference, the findings of these tables have been summarized in Table II-53, in which is also given the significance level (P-value) of the disproportionality between the SSA and CS samples as computed by chi-square.

A glance at Table II-53 shows the two samples to differ significantly on every item. In comparison to SSA teachers, CS teachers (1) had a higher level of education and more courses in testing, (2) more often adopted a tentative or critical attitude** toward the usefulness of tests,

---

*Tables will be found at the end of each chapter. Throughout this report tabulations will customarily be given in percentages. The group within which the percentages are taken will in every case be signalled by entry of 100 for a total. The base number of cases used in computing the percentages will appear under the label "N".

The time at which the data were collected and which is used to represent the SI sample is indicated in each of the detailed tables. The choice of time was often dictated by the fact that the measurement was not taken at other times. In many cases, the spring 1960 data were used to maintain uniformity with tables showing data which were gathered only at that time.

**-- namely, attitude B: "A test score is...useful in raising important questions in my mind about my students." See Appendix, Section I, Item 17.

(3) reported less frequent discussion of test results with students and parents, (4) were more accepting toward intelligence and achievement tests, and (5) were less accepting toward interest and personality tests.

We found in Projects 509 and 702 that level of training was often associated with other variables. Since we saw in Table II-53 that the mean level of training (Items 1 and 2) increased somewhat over the intervening period, it may be that some of the other differences in Table II-53 can be attributed to the increase in training. In particular, the increased preference for the critical attitude B toward the usefulness of tests at the later time (CS) is consistent with the similar finding in Project 509 (Chapter V, Table V); the increased acceptance of intelligence and achievement tests is consistent with the relation found in Project 509 between training and the number of kinds of tests desired (Chapter V, Table III; this relation is also reflected in Table VII-5 of the Project 702 report).

The finding that the CS teachers reported less frequent discussion of test results with students and parents than SSA teachers (Items 4 and 5 of Table II-53) is not consistent with the finding in Project 509 (Chapter V, Table IX) that more discussion was reported by those with higher levels of training. Another puzzling finding is that, contrary to their response to the more traditional types of tests, the teachers in the CS sample less frequently desired interest and personality tests to be administered in their schools than did the teachers in the SSA sample.* These two disconcerting findings will be mentioned again below.

---

*It should be noted, however, that in no case did a majority of teachers desire that some kind of test not be administered. The percentages of teachers in either sample saying a particular kind of test should be administered ranged from 55 per cent (for personality tests in the CS sample) to 85 per cent (for intelligence tests in the CS sample). See Tables II-6 through 11.

## Stability of responses of counselors and administrators in the SSA and CS samples

The responses of counselors (Tables II-12 through 22) are summarized in respect to the SSA and CS samples in Table II-54 and the responses of administrators (Tables II-23 through 33) are summarized in Table II-55. These tables show much more stability than did Table II-53 for teachers; the general decrease of significant differences in the tables for counselors and administrators is paralleled by the fact that they show much less change in level of training than did the table for teachers. Tables II-54 and 55 show no inconsistencies either internally or in comparison with the findings of Projects 509 and 702.

Having found no troublesome contradictions in the responses of counselors or administrators, let us return to the responses of teachers which disconcerted us earlier. In discussing our findings (Table II-53), we mentioned only one explanatory principle: that of increased training. In speculating about the changes on the part of teachers, we might also consider the widespread discussion which was being given during the school year 1959-60 to the "search for talent." Both in educational circles and in the public press, much was said and written about the urgency of identifying the academically superior student. The attention of school people was also drawn to the new importance being given to guidance by the numerous training institutes made available to them under the National Defense Education Act in the summers of 1959 and 1960.

If the publicity given in 1959-60 to the needs of the academically talented had an effect on attitudes toward guidance and testing, it would, presumably, have produced an increased receptiveness to the directly relevant types of tests such as we found on the part of teachers (Items 6-9 of Table II-53), counselors (Items 17 and 18 of Table II-54), and administrators (Items 28-30 of Table II-55). At the same time, perhaps by a contrast effect, the emphasis on academic aptitude may have produced a reduced preference for tests of interest and personality such as we saw on the part of teachers in Items 10 and 11 of Table II-53. Only the increased preference for interest tests among administrators is left unexplained.

It is also conceivable that the publicity about the search for talent would persuade teachers that they should leave the discussion of test results with students and parents to those having training in the technicalities of testing: the counselors and administrators. If a view were developing during 1959-60 toward leaving test interpretation to trained personnel, we should expect a reduction in the frequency with which teachers reported discussing test results with students and parents as seen in Items 4 and 5 of Table II-53; but we should expect little change on the part of counselors and administrators,* and indeed Items 15 and 16 of Table II-54 and Items 26 and 27 of Table II-55 showed non-significant changes.

As to the increase in educational level on the part of teachers (Items 1 and 2 of Table II-53), this may reflect a general trend in Illinois due to certification requirements and salary policies. Unfortunately, statewide statistics on the educational level of school personnel in 1960 are not yet available at this writing. The increase in number of courses in testing on the part of teachers and counselors may be a consequence, in part, of the availability of summer institutes in guidance in 1959 and 1960.

In summary, taking the comparison of the SSA and the CS samples to indicate stability in the same population over a year's time, the items selected for the basis of comparison portray counselors and administrators as giving about the same distributions of response at the two times except for some tendency to feel more frequently that it would be desirable to administer tests of intelligence, academic aptitude, achievement in subject fields, and interests. Teachers, on the other hand, showed more variability. There was evidence that they increased in level of general education and in the specific area of courses in the technicalities of testing. Some of their other changes may have been caused partly by this change in level of training. Another possible explanation of the further changes is that the teachers were responding to the heightened attention being given in recent years to guidance and the search for academic talent.

---

*Table V-2 shows that administrators and counselors resembled each other in all three samples in respect to number of courses in testing.

Explanations have been given for most of the instabilities reported in this section; however, some of the explanations were speculative. The meaning of these instabilities in respect to the validity of the separate studies would be difficult to assess with only the information we so far have presented. The question of the reliability of the sampling will be postponed until later in the report.

## Comparisons of All Three Samples

Summaries of the results shown in Tables II-1 through 33, but this time taking all three samples into consideration, are given in Tables II-56, 57, and 58. The comparison of all three samples gives some evidence, even if only suggestive, for our earlier speculation that the changes on the part of teachers between the SSA sampling and the CS sampling might have been due to the effect of the present to-do over guidance and the search for talent. The evidence lies in the comparison of the SI sample with the other two. The SI sample was a collection of schools in which we know that the thoughts of faculty members were turned to matters of guidance and testing more frequently than ordinarily would be the case by the visits of our own research staff and the extensive data collection to which we subjected the faculty members.

Turning to Tables II-1 through 11 (the tables showing responses of teachers) we note that the distributions of the responses in the CS sample were much more like the distributions in the SI sample than like those in the SSA sample in Tables II-4 through 11; in most of these tables the distributions for the CS samples and the SI samples are almost identical even though the SI sample used in these tables was studied half a year earlier than the CS sample. The pattern is reflected in Table II-56 in the fact that the entries in that table corresponding to Tables II-4 through 11 all mention the SSA sample as standing out from the other two. It will be noticed in Table II-57, summarizing the responses of counselors, that the same pattern occurs in the statistically significant entries corresponding to Tables II-15 through 22. Correspondingly, in Table II-58, summarizing responses of administrators, the same pattern again occurs among the statistically significant entries corresponding to Tables II-26 through 33, except in the one case of the entry corresponding to Table II-27.

If this interpretation (that changes in attitudes about guidance and testing occurred over the 1959-60 school year in response to publicity about these matters) is correct, we would not expect Tables II-3, 14, and 25 (test attitude ABC) to show the same pattern we have just been describing of similarity between the CS and SI samples because the data for the SI sample on that particular item were gathered in the fall of 1959, only half a year after the SSA data but a year before the CS data. And in fact, these three tables depart from the general pattern; they do not show the SI and CS samples to be more similar to each other than to the SSA sample.

On the basis of the evidence so far, it seems reasonable to conclude, at least tentatively, that the SSA and CS samples represented the same population, showing only those differences which could have resulted from the response of that population to influences acting upon it during the year's period. Furthermore, the SI sample seems to have been representative of secondary schools in the state as a whole (at least in regard to the attitudes and the practices we have been discussing) at the times shown in the tables, although there were differences in general education and number of courses in testing between the CS and SI samples. Further information in regard to this point will be given below.

## Responses of Teachers in the SI and CS Samples

In addition to comparisons on the items already described, the responses of teachers in the SI and CS samples were compared on other items common only to these two samples so as to broaden the basis for assessing the representativeness of the SI sample. The detailed results are given in Tables II-34 through 52 and summarized in Table II-59.

The first thing notable about Table II-59 is that few of the items on which teachers' responses in these two samples were compared showed a significant difference. In regard to practices in disseminating test results to teachers, the teachers of the SI sample were more often in favor of obtaining test results through consultation with an appointed person (Appendix, Section I, Item 5, marginally numbered 30) and by receiving descriptive reports which they might keep (Appendix, Section I, Item 5, marginally numbered 33). No explanation readily comes to mind why these two particular items should show a difference between the two samples, unless the cause lies in the kind of training about these matters received by the persons in the two samples. Before going on with this thought, let us go on to the other items in Table II-59 which showed differences.

In regard to agreement with experts (the instructors of the summer institute at the University of Illinois) on what duties should be included in the counselor's role (see Section III of the Appendix to this report and Chapter V of the report on Project 702), Table II-47 shows that the CS sample was in higher agreement with the SI experts than the SI sample and that the SI answers increased their difference from the 1960 CS answers from fall 1959 to fall 1960. This, too, seems an odd result.

Teachers in the SI sample reported sending more students to the counselor for vocational and educational counseling than did those in the CS sample. These were the duties most solidly included in the core role for the counselor described in Chapter V of the report on Project 702. Finally, we note that teachers in the SI sample sent fewer students to the counselor for disciplinary reasons than did those in the CS sample. The disciplinary use of the counselor was one of the items which most respondents (and the experts also) in Project 702 agreed upon as not being appropriate (see the report on Project 702, Table V-2 in Volume I and Appendix I, Item 4 in Volume II).

In brief, the differences in reasons for sending students to the counselor between the SI and CS samples were in a direction which would have been preferred by the instructors in the summer institute at the University of Illinois. The more careful methods of dissemination of test results to teachers upon which the two samples differed might well also be methods of which the summer institute instructors would have approved.

Of the items in Table II-59, we are now left only with the difference in agreement with the experts as an item for which no explanation seems at hand. However, it is conceivable that the very intensity of our research in the SI schools and the attention we drew to the opinions of the institute trainee in those schools resulted in some persons turning against the ideas being promulgated. The difference between the SI and CS samples was not large. Such a "negativistic" minority may also have produced the disproportionate number of choices of the tests-are-no-good attitude in the SI sample, as shown in Table II-3. This matter of agreement with experts will be discussed further in Chapter IV.

In summary, Table II-59 seems to us to show that the SI sample was very representative of secondary teachers in the state as a whole with the exception of a few items which might well have shown the differences they did because of the particular kind of instruction received by the SI summer institute participants. This interpretation is especially suitable to the findings of the Tables II-48, 49, and 52. This explanation may seem dubious; it may seem that we are hoping for too much from training one member of a faculty in a particular summer institute. Yet the facts are that when 28 schools sending trainees to the summer institute at the University of Illinois were compared with a random sample of schools and six of 19 items were found to show significant differences, five of the six (Items 36, 37, 48, 49, and 52 in Table II-59) were differences which the summer institute instructors would wish to have occurred. This explanation, that certain differences between samples may have been due to the influence of the summer institute trainees, will be discussed again in Chapter IV. We shall also show in Chapter IV that there were many more differences between the SI and CS samples when all respondents, not only teachers, are taken into account.

Table II-1. General education of teachers in the three samples. Entries in body of table are percentages. Underlined percentages are greater than expected from marginal totals.

| Sample | Bachelor's or less | Less than master's | Master's | Adv. cert. or less | More than adv. cert. | Total | N |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| SSA | 24.0 | 27.7 | 29.0 | 13.0 | 6.3 | 100 | 2688 |
| CS | 13.6 | 32.6 | 32.8 | 15.9 | 5.1 | 100 | 842 |
| SI(spring) | 19.6 | 26.7 | 21.8 | 22.4 | 9.5 | 100 | 423 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3953 |

Chi-square = 82.27. P < .001

Table II-2. Number of courses in testing of teachers in the three samples.

|  | Courses |  |  |  |  |  |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Sample | None | One | Two | ≤ 3 | Total | N |
| SSA | 22.8 | 39.2 | 25.2 | 12.8 | 100 | 2684 |
| CS | 15.0 | 31.0 | 30.1 | 23.9 | 100 | 828 |
| SI(spring) | 23.9 | 34.0 | 28.1 | 14.0 | 100 | 423 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | 3935 |

Chi-square = 91.09 P < .001

Table II-3. Test attitude ABC among teachers in the three samples.

|  | Attitude |  |  |  |  |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Sample | A | B | C | Total | N |
| SSA | 40.9 | 53.4 | 5.7 | 100 | 2612 |
| CS | 32.6 | 61.0 | 6.4 | 100 | 831 |
| SI(1959) | 36.8 | 53.4 | 9.8 | 100 | 386 |
|  |  |  |  |  | 3829 |

Chi-square = 27.68

P < .001

Table II-4. Discussion of test results with parents among teachers in the three samples.

| | Discussion | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Sample | Never | Rarely | Some-times | Fre-quently | Total | N |
| SSA | 16.5 | 32.3 | 39.8 | 11.4 | 100 | 2643 |
| CS | 39.6 | 32.0 | 24.9 | 3.5 | 100 | 815 |
| SI(spring) | 33.0 | 34.2 | 28.4 | 4.4 | 100 | 412 |
| | | | | | | 3870 |

Chi-square = 263.55. P < .001

Table II-5. Discussion of test results with students among teachers in the three samples.

| | Discussion | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Sample | Never | Rarely | Some-times | Fre-quently | Total | N |
| SSA | 12.3 | 21.8 | 49.0 | 16.9 | 100 | 2664 |
| CS | 29.7 | 26.2 | 35.9 | 8.2 | 100 | 821 |
| SI(spring) | 24.8 | 32.2 | 32.9 | 10.1 | 100 | 416 |
| | | | | | | 3901 |

Chi-square = 392.62. P < .001

Table II-6. Answers of teachers in the three samples to the question whether intelligence tests should be administered.

| Sample | Yes | No | Total | N |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| SSA | 68.6 | 31.4 | 100 | 2418 |
| CS | 85.1 | 14.9 | 100 | 839 |
| SI(spring) | 89.1 | 10.9 | 100 | 423 |
| | | | | 3680 |

Chi-square = 142.30

P < .001

Table II-7. Answers of teachers in the three samples to the question whether academic aptitude tests should be administered.

| Sample | Yes | No | Total | N |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| SSA | 72.7 | 27.3 | 100 | 2418 |
| CS | 84.4 | 15.6 | 100 | 839 |
| SI(spring) | 84.6 | 15.4 | 100 | 423 |
| | | | | 3680 |

Chi-square = 63.64

P < .001

Table II-8. Answers of teachers in the three samples to the question whether achievement tests in subject fields should be administered.

| Sample | Yes | No | Total | N |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| SSA | 69.6 | 30.4 | 100 | 2418 |
| CS | 74.9 | 25.1 | 100 | 839 |
| SI(spring) | 74.5 | 25.5 | 100 | 423 |
| | | | | 3680 |

Chi-square = 10.94

P < .001

Table II-9. Answers of teachers in the three samples to the question whether reading achievement tests should be administered.

| Sample | Yes | No | Total | N |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| SSA | 74.1 | 25.9 | 100 | 2418 |
| CS | 79.7 | 20.3 | 100 | 839 |
| SI(spring) | 86.8 | 13.2 | 100 | 423 |
| | | | | 3680 |

Chi-square = 37.40

P < .001

Table II-10. Answers of teachers in the three samples to the question whether interest tests should be administered.

| Sample | Yes | No | Total | N |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| SSA | 77.2 | 22.8 | 100 | 2418 |
| CS | 67.6 | 32.4 | 100 | 839 |
| SI(spring) | 74.5 | 25.5 | 100 | 423 |
| | | | | 3680 |

Chi-square = 29.79

P < .001

Table II-11. Answers of teachers in the three samples to the question whether personality tests should be administered.

| Sample | Yes | No | Total | N |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| SSA | 70.7 | 29.3 | 100 | 2418 |
| CS | 55.3 | 44.7 | 100 | 839 |
| SI(spring) | 54.1 | 45.9 | 100 | 423 |
| | | | | 3680 |

Chi-square = 91.46

P < .001

Table II-12. General education among counselors in the three samples. "NS" means P > .10.

| Sample | Less than master's | Master's | Adv. cert. or less | More than adv. cert. | Total | N |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| SSA | 8.3 | 33.2 | 35.4 | 23.1 | 100 | 229 |
| CS | 3.1 | 37.6 | 31.2 | 28.1 | 100 | 32 |
| SI(spring) | 11.9 | 25.0 | 46.4 | 16.7 | 100 | 84 |
| | | | | | | 345 |

Chi-square = 8.32. NS

Table II-13. Courses in testing among counselors in the three samples.

| Sample | 0-1 | 2 | ≤ 3 | Total | N |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| SSA | 29.3 | 25.7 | 45.0 | 100 | 222 |
| CS | 6.3 | 28.1 | 65.6 | 100 | 32 |
| SI(spring) | 17.1 | 37.8 | 45.1 | 100 | 82 |
| | | | | | 336 |

Chi-square
= 13.52
P < .02

Table II-14. Test attitude ABC among counselors in the three samples.

| Sample | A | B | C | Total | N |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| SSA | 36.7 | 62.4 | 0.9 | 100 | 210 |
| CS | 27.6 | 72.4 | 0 | 100 | 29 |
| SI(1959) | 20.2 | 71.4 | 8.4 | 100 | 84 |
| | | | | | 323 |

Chi-square (A vs B only) = 5.72
.05 < P < .10

Table II-15. Discussion of test results with parents among counselors in the three samples.

| Sample | Never, rarely, or sometimes | Frequently | Total | N |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| SSA | 45.6 | 54.4 | 100 | 228 |
| CS | 53.1 | 46.9 | 100 | 32 |
| SI(spring) | 41.2 | 58.8 | 100 | 85 |
| | | | | 345 |

Chi-square = 1.92

NS

Table II-16. Discussion of test results with students among counselors in the three samples.

| Sample | Never, rarely, or sometimes | Frequently | Total | N |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| SSA | 25.4 | 74.6 | 100 | 228 |
| CS | 34.4 | 65.6 | 100 | 32 |
| SI(spring) | 30.6 | 69.4 | 100 | 85 |
| | | | | 345 |

Chi-square = 1.70. NS

Table II-17. Answers of counselors in the three samples to the question whether intelligence tests should be administered.

| Sample | Yes | No | Total | N |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| SSA | 68.4 | 31.6 | 100 | 206 |
| CS | 87.5 | 12.5 | 100 | 32 |
| SI(spring) | 92.9 | 7.1 | 100 | 85 |
| | | | | 323 |

Chi-square = 22.31

$P < .001$

Table II-18. Answers of counselors in the three samples to the question whether academic aptitude tests should be administered.

| Sample | Yes | No | Total | N |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| SSA | 67.5 | 32.5 | 100 | 206 |
| CS | 87.5 | 12.5 | 100 | 32 |
| SI(spring) | 95.3 | 4.7 | 100 | 85 |
| | | | | 323 |

Chi-square = 28.19

$P < .001$

Table II-19. Answers of counselors in the three samples to the question whether achievement tests in subject matter fields should be administered.

| Sample | Yes | No | Total | N |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| SSA | 71.8 | 28.2 | 100 | 206 |
| CS | 75.0 | 25.0 | 100 | 32 |
| SI(spring) | 92.9 | 7.1 | 100 | 85 |
| | | | | 323 |

Chi-square = 15.67

$P < .001$

Table II-20. Answers of counselors in the three samples to the question whether reading achievement tests should be administered.

| Sample | Yes | No | Total | N |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| SSA | 72.3 | 27.7 | 100 | 206 |
| CS | 81.3 | 18.7 | 100 | 32 |
| SI(spring) | 89.4 | 10.6 | 100 | 85 |
| | | | | 323 |

Chi-square = 10.35

P < .01

Table II-21. Answers of counselors in the three samples to the question whether interest tests should be administered.

| Sample | Yes | No | Total | N |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| SSA | 71.8 | 28.2 | 100 | 206 |
| CS | 68.8 | 31.2 | 100 | 32 |
| SI(spring) | 77.6 | 22.4 | 100 | 85 |
| | | | | 323 |

Chi-square = 1.33

NS

Table II-22. Answers of counselors in the three samples to the question whether personality tests should be administered.

| Sample | Yes | No | Total | N |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| SSA | 73.8 | 26.2 | 100 | 206 |
| CS | 58.1 | 41.9 | 100 | 31 |
| SI(spring) | 55.3 | 44.7 | 100 | 85 |
| | | | | 322 |

Chi-square = 10.39

P < .01

Table II-23. General education among administrators in the three samples.

| Sample | Less than master's | Master's | Adv. cert. or less | More than adv. cert. | Total | N |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| SSA | 1.9 | 41.1 | 36.7 | 20.3 | 100 | 521 |
| CS | 3.7 | 48.2 | 37.0 | 11.1 | 100 | 54 |
| SI(spring) | 17.0 | 25.0 | 43.7 | 14.3 | 100 | 112 |
| | | | | | | 687 |

Chi-square = 59.99. P < .001

Table II-24. Courses in testing among administrators in the three samples.

| | Courses | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Sample | 0-1 | 2 | ≤ 3 | Total | N |
| SSA | 20.1 | 30.0 | 49.9 | 100 | 517 |
| CS | 17.0 | 9.4 | 54.6 | 100 | 53 |
| SI(spring) | 27.3 | 39.1 | 33.6 | 100 | 110 |
| | | | | | 680 |

Chi-square = 11.70

P < .02

Table II-25. Test attitude ABC among administrators in the three samples.

| | Attitude | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Sample | A | B | C | Total | N |
| SSA | 48.8 | 50.4 | 0.8 | 100 | 508 |
| CS | 47.2 | 52.8 | 0.0 | 100 | 53 |
| SI(1959) | 26.6 | 64.2 | 9.2 | 100 | 109 |
| | | | | | 670 |

Chi-square (A vs B only) = 13.86
P < .001

Table II-26. Discussion of test results with parents among administrators in the three samples.

| Sample | Never | Rarely | Sometimes | Frequently | Total | N |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| SSA | 1.0 | 9.8 | 48.3 | 40.9 | 100 | 518 |
| CS | 3.8 | 9.4 | 43.4 | 43.4 | 100 | 53 |
| SI(spring) | 20.2 | 14.7 | 36.7 | 28.4 | 100 | 109 |
| | | | | | | 680 |

Chi-square = 80.16. P < .001

Table II-27. Discussion of test results with students among administrators in the three samples.

| Sample | Never or rarely | Sometimes | Frequently | Total | N |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| SSA | 5.0 | 36.9 | 58.1 | 100 | 520 |
| CS | 9.3 | 25.9 | 64.8 | 100 | 54 |
| SI(spring) | 30.3 | 38.5 | 31.2 | 100 | 109 |
| | | | | | 683 |

Chi-square = 78.70

P < .001

Table II-28. Answers of administrators in the three samples to the question whether intelligence tests should be administered.

| Sample | Yes | No | Total | N |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| SSA | 61.6 | 38.4 | 100 | 464 |
| CS | 96.3 | 3.7 | 100 | 54 |
| SI(spring) | 90.1 | 9.9 | 100 | 111 |
| | | | | 629 |

Chi-square = 53.78

P < .001

Table II-29. Answers of administrators in the three samples to the question whether academic aptitude tests should be administered.

| Sample | Yes | No | Total | N |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| SSA | 66.4 | 33.6 | 100 | 464 |
| CS | 94.4 | 5.6 | 100 | 54 |
| SI(spring) | 89.2 | 10.8 | 100 | 111 |
| | | | | 629 |

Chi-square = 37.90

P < .001

Table II-30. Answers of administrators in the three samples to the question whether achievement tests in subject matter fields should be administered.

| Sample | Yes | No | Total | N |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| SSA | 66.6 | 33.4 | 100 | 464 |
| CS | 88.9 | 11.1 | 100 | 54 |
| SI(spring) | 89.2 | 10.8 | 100 | 111 |
| | | | | 629 |

Chi-square = 34.91

P < .001

Table II-31. Answers of administrators in the three samples to the question whether reading achievement tests should be administered.

| Sample | Yes | No | Total | N |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| SSA | 69.0 | 31.0 | 100 | 464 |
| CS | 81.5 | 18.5 | 100 | 54 |
| SI(spring) | 91.9 | 8.1 | 100 | 111 |
| | | | | 629 |

Chi-square = 26.69

P < .001

Table II-32. Answers of administrators in the three samples to the question whether interest tests should be administered.

| Sample | Yes | No | Total | N |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| SSA | 72.2 | 27.8 | 100 | 464 |
| CS | 87.0 | 13.0 | 100 | 54 |
| SI(spring) | 84.7 | 15.3 | 100 | 111 |
| | | | | 629 |

Chi-square = 11.54

P < .005

Table II-33. Answers of administrators in the three samples to the question whether personality tests should be administered.

| Sample | Yes | No | Total | N |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| SSA | 70.9 | 29.1 | 100 | 464 |
| CS | 75.5 | 24.5 | 100 | 53 |
| SI(spring) | 60.4 | 39.6 | 100 | 111 |
| | | | | 628 |

Chi-square = 5.54

.05 < P < .10

Table II-34. Answers of SI and CS teachers to the question whether the information which the school obtains and files about students is sufficient.

| Sample | Yes | No | Uncertain | Total | N |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| SI(spring) | 59.7 | 21.9 | 18.4 | 100 | 424 |
| CS | 59.4 | 21.3 | 19.3 | 100 | 832 |
| | | | | | 1256 |

Yes *vs* no: chi-square = 0.03, NS
Yes or no *vs* uncertain: chi-square = 0.17, NS

Table II-35. Answers of SI and CS teachers concerning test dissemination to teachers: should test scores be made available in an administrative office?

| Sample | Yes | No | Total | N |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| SI(spring) | 58.4 | 41.6 | 100 | 413 |
| CS | 60.6 | 39.4 | 100 | 840 |
| | | | | 1253 |

Chi-square = 0.58
NS

Table II-36. Answers of SI and CS teachers concerning test dissemination to teachers: should scores be kept in a particular office where an appointed person will discuss the results?

| Sample | Yes | No | Total | N |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| SI(spring) | 57.6 | 42.4 | 100 | 413 |
| CS | 50.1 | 49.9 | 100 | 840 |
| | | | | 1253 |

Chi-square = 6.39

$P < .02$

Table II-37. Answers of SI and CS teachers concerning test dissemination to teachers: should test results in descriptive form be given to the teacher for the teacher to keep?

| Sample | Yes | No | Total | N |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| SI(spring) | 30.5 | 69.5 | 100 | 413 |
| CS | 24.6 | 75.4 | 100 | 840 |
| | | | | 1253 |

Chi-square = 4.73

$P < .05$

Table II-38. Answers of SI and CS teachers concerning test dissemination to teachers: should group meetings be held at which test results are explained and discussed with the teachers?

| Sample | Yes | No | Total | N |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| SI(spring) | 51.8 | 48.2 | 100 | 413 |
| CS | 51.0 | 49.0 | 100 | 840 |
| | | | | 1253 |

Chi-square = 0.06. NS

Table II-39. Answers of SI and CS teachers concerning test dissemination to parents: should it be the practice that any parent who wishes may confer with the principal or guidance counselor and receive information about his children's test results? -- that is, that teachers should not give such information?

| Sample | Yes | No | Total | N |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| SI(spring) | 73.3 | 26.7 | 100 | 423 |
| CS | 73.6 | 26.4 | 100 | 772 |
| | | | | 1195 |

Chi-square = 0.02. NS

**Table II-40.** Answers of SI and CS teachers concerning test dissemination to parents: should it be the practice that any parent who wishes can confer with any teacher and receive such information?

| Sample | Yes | No | Total | N |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| SI(spring) | 14.9 | 85.1 | 100 | 423 |
| CS | 15.9 | 84.1 | 100 | 772 |
| | | | | 1195 |

Chi-square = 0.20. NS

**Table II-41.** Answers of SI and CS teachers concerning test dissemination to parents: should it be the practice that parents whose children present academic or disciplinary problems are called in for conference and test results are used as part of the conference?

| Sample | Yes | No | Total | N |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| SI(spring) | 59.6 | 40.4 | 100 | 423 |
| CS | 61.3 | 38.7 | 100 | 772 |
| | | | | 1195 |

Chi-square = 0.38. NS

**Table II-42.** Answers of SI and CS teachers concerning test dissemination to students: should teachers discuss test results with students when the occasion arises or the need occurs (largely at the discretion of the teacher)?

| Sample | Yes | No | Total | N |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| SI(spring) | 41.3 | 56.9 | 100 | 420 |
| CS | 39.8 | 60.2 | 100 | 772 |
| | | | | 1192 |

Chi-square = 1.23. NS

**Table II-43.** Answers of SI and CS teachers concerning test dissemination to students: should counselors confer at certain times with students individually and discuss his test results in the context of the students' future plans?

| Sample | Yes | No | Total | N |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| SI(spring) | 89.0 | 11.0 | 100 | 420 |
| CS | 85.9 | 14.1 | 100 | 772 |
| | | | | 1192 |

Chi-square = 2.63. NS

Table II-44. Answers of SI and CS teachers concerning test dissemination to students: should students meet in groups, and an experienced teacher or counselor discuss test results and their meaning in general terms?

| Sample | Yes | No | Total | N |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| SI(spring) | 57.8 | 42.2 | 100 | 424 |
| CS | 63.1 | 36.9 | 100 | 835 |
| | | | | 1259 |

Chi-square = 3.37. NS

Table II-45. Test Discussion Scores (TDS) of SI and CS teachers: discussion of tests with parents, students, and other teachers.

| | TDS score | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Sample | 0-1 | 2-3 | 4-5 | 6-9 | Total | N |
| SI(spring) | 17.4 | 25.9 | 31.5 | 25.2 | 100 | 425 |
| CS | 17.4 | 29.8 | 29.1 | 23.7 | 100 | 832 |
| | | | | | | 1257 |

Chi-square = 2.33 NS

Table II-46. Satisfaction of SI and CS teachers with kinds of tests administered in the school.

| Sample | 3 or more kinds desired than given | 2 more kinds desired than given | One more kind desired than given | Same kinds desired as given | More kinds given than desired | Total | N |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| SI(spring) | 12.0 | 16.7 | 20.4 | 25.9 | 25.0 | 100 | 401 |
| CS | 14.1 | 14.6 | 19.1 | 26.7 | 25.5 | 100 | 803 |
| | | | | | | | 1204 |

Chi-square = 2.31. NS

Table II-47. Mean agreement with experts on the 25-item Counselor's Role Checklist (appropriateness) on the part of SI and CS teachers.

| Sample | N | Mean | Std. dev. | Difference from CS | t | P |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| SI(fall 1959) | 582 | 15.62 | 4.79 | -1.01 | -4.17 | <.001 |
| SI(spring) | 601 | 15.64 | 4.77 | - .99 | -4.08 | <.001 |
| SI(fall 1960) | 391 | 15.18 | 4.87 | -1.45 | -5.33 | <.001 |
| CS(fall 1960) | 746 | 16.63 | | | | |

Note: Means for the SI sample in this table do not agree with the means in Table V-9 of the final report on Project 702 because (1) SIPs were not included in Table V-9 of Project 702 and (2) some respondents in Project 702 who omitted large numbers of items in the Counselor's Role Checklist were counted as having low agreement with the experts instead of more properly being counted as not having answered the Checklist. These latter persons were removed from the present table.

Table II-48. Number of students referred to counselor last year for vocational counseling by teachers in SI and CS samples.

| Sample | None | 1-9 | 10-up | Total | N |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| SI(1960) | 70.9 | 20.7 | 8.4 | 100 | 309 |
| CS | 79.5 | 14.2 | 6.3 | 100 | 781 |
| | | | | | 1090 |

Chi-square = 9.26

P < .01

Table II-49. Number of students referred to counselor last year for educational counseling by teachers in SI and CS samples.

| Sample | None | 1-9 | 10-up | Total | N |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| SI(1960) | 64.2 | 21.1 | 14.7 | 100 | 279 |
| CS | 74.1 | 15.4 | 10.5 | 100 | 765 |
| | | | | | 1044 |

Chi-square = 9.58

P < .01

Table II-50. Number of students referred to counselor last year concerning college goals by teachers in SI and CS samples.

| Sample | None | 1-9 | 10-up | Total | N |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| SI(1960) | 69.2 | 19.9 | 10.9 | 100 | 292 |
| CS | 74.6 | 17.5 | 7.9 | 100 | 771 |
| | | | | | 1063 |

Chi-square = 3.35

NS

Table II-51. Number of students referred to counselor last year concerning academic problems by teachers in SI and CS samples.

| Sample | None | 1-9 | 10-up | Total | N |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| SI(1960) | 74.2 | 18.8 | 7.0 | 100 | 298 |
| CS | 79.8 | 14.4 | 5.8 | 100 | 779 |
| | | | | | 1077 |

Chi-square = 4.53

NS

Table II-52. Number of students referred to counselor last year concerning disciplinary problems by teachers in SI and CS samples.

| Sample | None | 1-9 | 10-up | Total | N |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| SI(1960) | 77.1 | 20.6 | 2.3 | 100 | 301 |
| CS | 75.6 | 18.0 | 6.4 | 100 | 766 |
| | | | | | 1067 |

Chi-square = 8.03

P < .025

Table II-53. Summary of Tables II-1 through 11 concerning differences among teachers in the SSA and CS samples. "P" means probability of the disproportionality by chi-square. "NS" means P > .05.

| Table | Variable | P | Direction |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | General education | <.001 | Note (a) |
| 2 | Number of courses in testing | <.001 | Note (b) |
| 3 | Test attitude ABC | <.001 | CS more "B" |
| 4 | Test discussion with parents | <.001 | SSA more frequently |
| 5 | Test discussion with students | <.001 | SSA more frequently |
| 6 | Should intelligence tests be administered? | <.001 | CS more "yes" |
| 7 | Should acad. apt. tests be admin.? | <.001 | CS more "yes" |
| 8 | Should subject field achievement tests be administered? | <.005 | CS more "yes" |
| 9 | Should reading achievement tests be administered? | <.005 | CS more "yes" |
| 10 | Should interest tests be admin.? | <.001 | SSA more "yes" |
| 11 | Should personality tests be admin.? | <.001 | SSA more "yes" |

(a) Disproportionality not monotonic; SSA averaged 33.3 semester hours past the bachelor's degree; CS averaged 36.1.

(b) SSA averaged 1.28 courses; CS 1.63.

Table II-54. Summary of Tables II-12 through 22 concerning differences among counselors in the SSA and CS samples. "P" means probability of the disproportionality by chi-square. "NS" means P > .05.

| Table | Variable | P | Direction |
|---|---|---|---|
| 12 | General education | NS | |
| 13 | Number of courses in testing | <.02 | Note (a) |
| 14 | Test attitude ABC | NS | |
| 15 | Test discussion with parents | NS | |
| 16 | Test discussion with students | NS | |
| 17 | Should intelligence tests be administered? | <.05 | CS more "yes" |
| 18 | Should acad. apt. tests be admin.? | <.02 | CS more "yes" |
| 19 | Should subject field achievement tests be administered? | NS | |
| 20 | Should reading achievement tests be administered? | NS | |
| 21 | Should interest tests be admin.? | NS | |
| 22 | Should personality tests be admin.? | NS | |

(a) SSA averaged 2.07 courses; CS 2.59.

Table II-55. Summary of Tables II-23 through 33 concerning differences among administrators in the SSA and CS samples. "P" means probability of the disproportionality by chi-square. "NS" means P > .05.

| Table | Variable | P | Direction |
|---|---|---|---|
| 23 | General education | NS | |
| 24 | Number of courses in testing | NS | |
| 25 | Test attitude ABC | NS | |
| 26 | Test discussion with parents | NS | |
| 27 | Test discussion with students | NS | |
| 28 | Should intelligence tests be administered? | <.001 | CS more "yes" |
| 29 | Should acad. apt. tests be administered? | <.001 | CS more "yes" |
| 30 | Should subject field achievement tests be administered? | <.001 | CS more "yes" |
| 31 | Should reading achievement tests be administered? | NS | |
| 32 | Should interest tests be administered? | <.025 | CS more "yes" |
| 33 | Should personality tests be administered? | NS | |

Table II-56. Summary of Tables II-1 through 11 concerning differences among teachers in the three samples. "P" means probability of the disproportionality by chi-square.

| Table | Variable | P | Direction |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | General education | <.001 | SI highest |
| 2 | Number of courses in testing | <.001 | CS highest |
| 3 | Test attitude ABC | <.001 | CS had most "B" |
| 4 | Test discussion with parents | <.001 | SSA most frequently |
| 5 | Test discussion with students | <.001 | SSA most frequently |
| 6 | Should intelligence tests be admin.? | <.001 | SSA most "no" |
| 7 | Should acad. apt. tests be admin.? | <.001 | SSA most "no" |
| 8 | Should subject field achievement tests be administered? | <.001 | SSA most "no" |
| 9 | Should reading achievement tests be administered? | <.001 | SSA most "no" |
| 10 | Should interest tests be admin.? | <.001 | SSA most "no" |
| 11 | Should personality tests be admin.? | <.001 | SSA most "no" |

Table II-57. Summary of Tables II-12 through 22 concerning differences among counselors in the three samples. "NS" means P > .05.

| Table | Variable | P | Direction |
|---|---|---|---|
| 12 | General education | NS | |
| 13 | Number of courses in testing | <.02 | CS highest |
| 14 | Test attitude ABC | NS | |
| 15 | Test discussion with parents | NS | |
| 16 | Test discussion with students | NS | |
| 17 | Should intelligence tests be admin.? | <.001 | SSA most "no" |
| 18 | Should acad. apt. tests be admin.? | <.001 | SSA most "no" |
| 19 | Should subject field achievement tests be administered? | <.001 | SSA most "no" |
| 20 | Should reading achievement tests be administered? | <.01 | SSA most "no" |
| 21 | Should interest tests be admin.? | NS | |
| 22 | Should personality tests be admin.? | <.01 | SSA most "yes" |

Table II-58. Summary of Tables II-23 through 33 concerning differences among administrators in the three samples. "NS" means P > .05.

| Table | Variable | P | Direction |
|---|---|---|---|
| 23 | General education | <.001 | SSA highest |
| 24 | Number of courses in testing | <.02 | SI lowest |
| 25 | Test attitude ABC | <.001 | SI had most "B" |
| 26 | Test discussion with parents | <.001 | SSA most frequently |
| 27 | Test discussion with students | <.001 | SI least often |
| 28 | Should intelligence tests be admin.? | <.001 | SSA most "no" |
| 29 | Should acad. apt. tests be admin.? | <.001 | SSA most "no" |
| 30 | Should subject field achievement tests be administered? | <.001 | SSA most "no" |
| 31 | Should reading achievement tests be administered? | <.001 | SSA most "no" |
| 32 | Should interest tests be admin.? | <.005 | SSA most "no" |
| 33 | Should personality tests be admin.? | NS | |

Table II-59. Summary of Tables II-34 through 52 concerning differences among teachers in the SI and CS samples. "NS" means P > .05.

| Table | Variable | P | Direction |
|---|---|---|---|
| 34 | Is information in files sufficient? | NS | |
| | Test dissemination to teachers: | | |
| 35 | Available in admin've office to all? | NS | |
| 36 | Under care of an appointed person? | <.02 | SI more "yes" |
| 37 | Descriptions for teacher to keep? | <.05 | SI more "yes" |
| 38 | Group meetings? | NS | |
| | Test dissemination to parents: | | |
| 39 | Parent who wishes may confer with principal or guid. coun. only? | NS | |
| 40 | Confer with any teacher? | NS | |
| 41 | Called in for child's problems? | NS | |
| | Test dissemination to students: | | |
| 42 | At discretion of teacher? | NS | |
| 43 | Counselors confer with individuals? | NS | |
| 44 | Group meetings? | NS | |
| 45 | TDS scores | NS | |
| 46 | Satisfaction with kinds of tests | NS | |
| 47 | Agreement with experts on appropriate counselor's role | <.001 | CS higher |
| | Students referred to counselor: | | |
| 48 | For vocational counseling | <.01 | SI more |
| 49 | For educational counseling | <.01 | SI more |
| 50 | College goals | NS | |
| 51 | Academic problems | NS | |
| 52 | Disciplinary problems | <.025 | CS more |

# CHAPTER III

## STABILITY AND REPRESENTATIVENESS: COMPARISONS OF THE SAMPLES ON RELATIONS BETWEEN VARIABLES

This chapter will compare the three samples in regard to relations between general education and other variables and also between number of courses in testing and other variables. Educational level and courses in testing were chosen partly because a limited number of items were available for comparisons across all three samples but also because training variables were given an important place in our earlier projects. These two training variables are ones on which each individual can be given a value or position; no attention will be paid to the school to which the individual might belong. Attention will be given to differences between persons in certain kinds of schools in Chapter IV.

Relations between general educational level and other variables are shown in Tables III-1 through 9, and relations between number of courses in testing and other variables are shown in Tables III-10 through 18. Most of these variables already have been met in Chapter II. The variable used in Tables III-9 and 18 (How many kinds of tests should be administered?) was taken from a comparison of the responses to Items 2 and 3 of Section I of the Appendix. The results presented in Tables III-1 through 18 are summarized in Table III-19.

### Comparisons of Relations across Samples

The first notable characteristic about Table III-19 is that it is liberally spattered with significant relations for every sample and for each training variable. Many more significant relations occurred than would be likely by chance. Furthermore, in every case where a relation was significant in more than one sample, the direction of the relation was the same from sample to sample, as is shown by the footnotes of Table III-19. Finally, inspection of the tables corresponding to the "NS" entries in Table III-19 shows that in most cases the trend was the same as in the samples where the relation was significant. On the whole, this sample of variables indicates that relations in one sample were very much like those in another.

Number of courses in testing, represented by the brief item we used, was probably a less reliable measure than general education; this may be one of the chief reasons that fewer significant relations showed up with it than with general education. This interpretation is buttressed by the fact that our previous studies showed frequent significant relations between an adequately reliable and objective test of knowledge about testing and other variables. In particular, Table III-19 shows a block of non-significant relations between number of courses of testing and the desire for certain traditional tests to be administered in the school (namely, the entries in Table III-19 corresponding to Tables III-13, 14, and 15). These items had only two answers, yes and no, and the marginals were very disparate, thus reducing the likelihood that a relation of a given strength would show up as significant.

A similar effect, which seems to have been ordered in time, can be seen in the case of the relations with test attitude ABC shown in Tables III-1 and 10. The data were collected for the SSA study in the spring of 1959, for SI in the fall of 1959, and for CS in the fall of 1960. It can be seen in Tables III-1 and 10 that the proportion of persons choosing answer "B" increased in the same order as that given by the time of data collection. Averaging the figures for "B" in the corresponding parts of the two tables, we see that 54 per cent of the respondents chose answer "B" in the spring of 1959 (SSA), that 57 per cent chose "B" in the fall of 1959 (SI), and that 61 per cent chose this answer in the fall of 1960 (CS). This pattern is consistent with the findings of Table II-53 discussed in the last chapter. Tables II-3, 14, and 25 in Chapter II suggest that the pattern just described was due chiefly to changes in the perceptions of teachers rather than in those of counselors or administrators. The fact that the relation between training and test attitude ABC became less significant over time may have been due to the increasing proportion of choices of one alternative.

It is interesting that in the case of Tables III-9 and 18 (How many kinds of tests should be administered?) four out of five significant relations showed that respondents with least training preferred an intermediate number of kinds of tests. It may have been that these respondents were expressing an acceptance of whatever kinds of tests were at present being administered in their schools.

## Tests of Differences between Samples

To make the comparisons of the relations found within the three samples more precise, we arbitrarily selected variables from Table III-19 and analyzed the resulting series of three-way contingency tables by the method of Lancaster.* In the first contingency table to be discussed, for example, the data were divided into categories according to (1) the sample from which they were taken, (2) general education, and (3) test attitude ABC (Appendix, Section I, Item 17). The results of the Lancaster analysis of these three variables are shown in the first line of Table III-20. Here we note (in the section headed "BC") that when all samples were pooled the relation between general education and test attitude ABC was not significant. This is not surprising when we recall that Table III-19 showed the relation to be significant only for the SSA sample. For completeness, Table III-20 then goes on (in the two sections headed "AC" and "AB") to show that the samples differed significantly from each other in their responses to test attitude ABC with all categories of general education pooled and that the samples differed from each other in general education with all classes of response to test attitude ABC pooled, this latter being a recapitulation of the finding displayed in Table II-1.**

---

*H. O. Lancaster. Complex contingency tables treated by the partition chi-square. Journal of the Royal Statistical Society, Series B, 1951, 13, 242, 249.

**All of the chi-squares in the sections of Tables III-20 and 21 headed "AB" would be identical within each table were it not for the fact that a few respondents omitted to answer certain of the questionnaire items, causing the collection of respondents used in each computation to differ slightly.

In the last section of the first line of Table III-20 (headed "interaction") we see that the disproportionality represented by the chi-square values in the three earlier sections of the table do not fully account for the total disproportionality found when all three variables are considered at once. In fact, the disproportionality remaining was significant with $P < .001$. This significant interaction chi-square indicates that the relation between general education and the test attitude ABC was significantly different from sample to sample. This is portrayed in Table III-19 by the fact that the relation was strongly significant in the SSA and non-significant in the other two samples.

Going on in Table III-20 to the relation between general education and the frequency of discussing test results with parents, we find that the relation between the two variables continues to be significant with all samples pooled (Table III-19 showed the relation to be significant in each sample separately) and that the interaction chi-square was non-significant, meaning that the relation did not differ from sample to sample. Turning next to the relation between general education and frequency of discussing test results with students, we find that this relation, which was significant in each sample separately (Table III-19), remains significant with all three samples pooled and that the interaction chi-square was also significant. This seems a bit strange. Turning back to Table III-3, we see that the difference in distribution [illegible] general trend of the relation but must have been due to differing strengths of the relation from one sample to another or to differences in the precise shape of the relation. Neither of these considerations, however, is important for our present purposes.

Going on in Table III-20 to the final entry showing the relation between general education and desire for interest tests to be administered, we note without surprise that the relation continued significant with all samples pooled and that the samples did not differ significantly one from another.

Table III-21 shows the corresponding results with number of courses in testing substituted for general education. The pattern of

Table III-21 is very similar to that of III-20. The only result here which requires further scrutiny is the significant interaction chi-square for the relation between number of courses in testing and frequency of test discussion with parents. Checking the relation within each sample by turning back to Table III-11, we note again that the trend in each sample was positively monotonic and that the disproportionality contributing to the significant interaction was again too subtle to deserve further attention here.

In all, on the basis of the variables examined, the samples seem to have been closely comparable except for the case of the relations between the training variables and test attitude ABC; this latter difference may have been due to changes over time in the distribution of responses to the test-attitude-ABC item. These results give us increased confidence that the members of the SI sample were representative of faculty members in secondary schools throughout the state of Illinois.

It is true that the variables presented in this chapter are a restricted sampling of the variables occurring in our earlier studies and an even more restricted sampling of the variables which others might have chosen to study. Nevertheless, these results, combined with those summarized in Table II-59 of the previous chapter and combined also with results to be presented in Chapters IV and V, encourage confidence in the reliability of the data gathered from these three samples.

Table III-1. Relation between general education and test attitude ABC in the three samples (all respondents). "NS" means P > .10.

SSA

| Attitude | Bachelor's or less | Less than master's | Master's | Adv. cert. or less | More than adv. cert. | Total | N |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| A | 18.6 | 21.2 | 30.8 | 20.5 | 8.9 | 100 | 1384 |
| B | 18.8 | 23.0 | 31.2 | 17.2 | 9.8 | 100 | 1775 |
| C | 34.6 | 25.6 | 26.3 | 5.1 | 8.4 | 100 | 156 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3315 |

Chi-square = 42.43. P < .001

CS

| Attitude | Bachelor's or less | Less than master's | Master's | Adv. cert. or less | More than adv. cert. | Total | N |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| A | 14.1 | 29.9 | 31.3 | 16.1 | 8.6 | 100 | 304 |
| B | 11.0 | 31.4 | 33.8 | 18.8 | 5.0 | 100 | 554 |
| C | 15.1 | 22.6 | 47.2 | 15.1 | 0.0 | 100 | 53 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 911 |

Chi-square = 14.75. .05 < P < .10

SI (1959)

| Attitude | Bachelor's or less | Less than master's | Master's | Adv. cert. or less | More than adv. cert. | Total | N |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| A | 15.0 | 18.5 | 23.1 | 34.7 | 8.7 | 100 | 173 |
| B | 15.7 | 17.9 | 23.6 | 29.1 | 13.7 | 100 | 313 |
| C | 9.8 | 27.5 | 17.6 | 29.4 | 15.7 | 100 | 51 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 537 |

Chi-square = 8.02. NS

Table III-2. Relation between general education and reported frequency of discussing test results with parents, in the three samples.

SSA

| Frequency of discussion | Bachelor's or less | Less than master's | Master's | Adv. cert. or less | More than adv. cert. | Total | N |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Frequently | 8.3 | 11.8 | 35.1 | 25.7 | 19.1 | 100 | 638 |
| Sometimes | 14.4 | 21.7 | 33.9 | 19.9 | 10.1 | 100 | 1394 |
| Rarely | 26.8 | 25.6 | 27.3 | 15.2 | 5.1 | 100 | 908 |
| Never | 33.6 | 30.1 | 26.0 | 7.6 | 2.7 | 100 | 435 |
| | | | | | | | 3375 |

Chi-square = 621.59. P < .001

CS

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Frequently | 3.0 | 6.1 | 39.4 | 33.3 | 18.2 | 100 | 66 |
| Sometimes | 7.9 | 29.0 | 36.5 | 19.5 | 7.1 | 100 | 241 |
| Rarely | 9.7 | 33.7 | 31.8 | 17.6 | 7.2 | 100 | 267 |
| Never | 17.9 | 32.4 | 32.7 | 13.9 | 3.1 | 100 | 324 |
| | | | | | | | 898 |

Chi-square = 68.90. P < .001

SI (spring)

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Frequently | 5.0 | 8.0 | 26.0 | 36.0 | 25.0 | 100 | 100 |
| Sometimes | 12.3 | 16.6 | 27.8 | 29.9 | 13.4 | 100 | 187 |
| Rarely | 15.0 | 29.4 | 18.8 | 30.0 | 6.8 | 100 | 160 |
| Never | 26.3 | 24.4 | 21.2 | 24.4 | 3.7 | 100 | 156 |
| | | | | | | | 603 |

Chi-square = 64.10. P < .001

Table III-3. Relation between general education and reported frequency of discussing test results with students, in the three samples.

SSA

| Frequency of discussion | Bachelor's of less | Less than master's | Master's | Adv. cert. or less | More than adv. cert. | Total | N |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Frequently | 8.4 | 13.9 | 35.3 | 25.2 | 17.2 | 100 | 920 |
| Sometimes | 18.1 | 24.0 | 31.5 | 18.4 | 8.0 | 100 | 1546 |
| Rarely | 30.4 | 27.7 | 25.1 | 11.8 | 5.0 | 100 | 602 |
| Never | 35.0 | 26.7 | 26.7 | 7.9 | 3.7 | 100 | 329 |
| | | | | | | | 3397 |

Chi-square = 338.32. P < .001

CS

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Frequently | 0.8 | 16.3 | 42.3 | 26.8 | 13.8 | 100 | 123 |
| Sometimes | 9.8 | 25.9 | 35.3 | 21.8 | 7.2 | 100 | 317 |
| Rarely | 12.4 | 43.6 | 27.5 | 12.4 | 4.1 | 100 | 218 |
| Never | 18.7 | 30.1 | 35.0 | 13.0 | 3.2 | 100 | 246 |
| | | | | | | | 904 |

Chi-square = 83.47. P < .001

SI (spring)

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Frequently | 6.7 | 8.9 | 30.4 | 29.6 | 24.4 | 100 | 135 |
| Sometimes | 15.3 | 18.7 | 23.2 | 33.0 | 9.8 | 100 | 203 |
| Rarely | 12.6 | 29.8 | 17.2 | 30.5 | 9.9 | 100 | 151 |
| Never | 27.9 | 26.3 | 22.9 | 21.2 | 1.7 | 100 | 118 |
| | | | | | | | 607 |

Chi-square = 76.31. P < .001

Table III-4. Relation between general education and opinion on whether academic aptitude tests should be administered, in the three samples.

SSA

| Opinion | Bachelor's or less | Less than master's | Master's | Adv. cert. or less | More than adv. cert. | Total | N |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Yes | 20.1 | 22.5 | 29.8 | 17.7 | 9.9 | 100 | 2199 |
| No | 18.1 | 22.2 | 34.7 | 17.1 | 7.9 | 100 | 875 |
| | | | | | | | 3074 |

Chi-square = 9.12. .05 < P < .10

CS

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Yes | 11.9 | 28.6 | 35.0 | 18.3 | 6.2 | 100 | 786 |
| No | 14.7 | 39.0 | 26.5 | 13.2 | 6.6 | 100 | 136 |
| | | | | | | | 922 |

Chi-square = 9.13. .05 < P < .10

SI (spring)

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Yes | 15.5 | 18.3 | 22.4 | 31.1 | 12.7 | 100 | 535 |
| No | 17.3 | 35.8 | 27.2 | 17.3 | 2.4 | 100 | 81 |
| | | | | | | | 616 |

Chi-square = 22.30. P < .001

Table III-5. Relation between general education and opinion on whether tests of achievement in subject fields should be administered, in the three samples.

SSA

| Opinion | Bachelor's or less | Less than master's | Master's | Adv. cert. or less | More than adv. cert. | Total | N |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Yes | 18.6 | 22.1 | 31.0 | 18.2 | 10.1 | 100 | 2132 |
| No | 21.7 | 23.1 | 31.6 | 15.8 | 7.8 | 100 | 942 |
| | | | | | | | 3074 |

Chi-square = 9.26. .05 < P < .10

CS

| Opinion | Bachelor's or less | Less than master's | Master's | Adv. cert. or less | More than adv. cert. | Total | N |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Yes | 11.1 | 27.3 | 35.4 | 19.1 | 7.1 | 100 | 703 |
| No | 16.0 | 39.2 | 28.3 | 12.8 | 3.7 | 100 | 219 |
| | | | | | | | 922 |

Chi-square = 20.70. P < .001

SI (spring)

| Opinion | Bachelor's or less | Less than master's | Master's | Adv. cert. or less | More than adv. cert. | Total | N |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Yes | 16.0 | 17.4 | 23.7 | 31.2 | 11.7 | 100 | 493 |
| No | 14.6 | 33.3 | 20.3 | 21.1 | 10.7 | 100 | 123 |
| | | | | | | | 616 |

Chi-square = 16.09. P < .01

Table III-6. Relation between general education and opinion on whether tests of achievement in reading should be administered, in the three samples.

SSA

| Opinion | Bachelor's or less | Less than master's | Master's | Adv. cert. or less | More than adv. cert. | Total | N |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Yes | 19.2 | 22.7 | 30.6 | 18.0 | 9.5 | 100 | 2252 |
| No | 20.4 | 21.4 | 33.0 | 16.3 | 8.9 | 100 | 822 |
| | | | | | | | 3074 |

Chi-square = 3.34. NS

CS

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Yes | 10.8 | 29.5 | 35.2 | 18.1 | 6.4 | 100 | 739 |
| No | 18.0 | 32.8 | 27.9 | 15.3 | 6.0 | 100 | 183 |
| | | | | | | | 922 |

Chi-square = 9.82. P < .05

SI (spring)

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Yes | 14.4 | 20.1 | 23.1 | 30.7 | 11.7 | 100 | 547 |
| No | 26.1 | 24.6 | 23.2 | 17.4 | 8.7 | 100 | 69 |
| | | | | | | | 616 |

Chi-square = 10.04. P < .05

Table III-7. Relation between general education and opinion on whether tests of interests should be administered, in the three samples.

SSA

| Opinion | Bachelor's or less | Less than master's | Master's | Adv. cert. or less | More than adv. cert. | Total | N |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Yes | 19.1 | 22.3 | 31.3 | 17.8 | 9.5 | 100 | 2337 |
| No | 21.0 | 22.8 | 30.8 | 16.7 | 8.7 | 100 | 737 |
| | | | | | | | 3074 |

Chi-square = 2.02. NS

CS

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Yes | 10.8 | 28.0 | 34.1 | 19.9 | 7.2 | 100 | 639 |
| No | 15.5 | 35.0 | 32.9 | 12.4 | 4.2 | 100 | 283 |
| | | | | | | | 922 |

Chi-square = 15.88. P < .01

SI (spring)

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Yes | 16.0 | 17.2 | 24.1 | 31.2 | 11.5 | 100 | 477 |
| No | 15.1 | 32.4 | 19.4 | 22.3 | 10.8 | 100 | 139 |
| | | | | | | | 616 |

Chi-square = 15.99. P < .01

Table III-8. Relation between general education and opinion on whether tests of personality should be administered, in the three samples.

SSA

| Opinion | Bachelor's or less | Less than master's | Master's | Adv. cert. or less | More than adv. cert. | Total | N |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Yes | 18.5 | 22.8 | 31.6 | 17.5 | 9.6 | 100 | 2180 |
| No | 22.1 | 21.3 | 30.3 | 17.8 | 8.5 | 100 | 894 |
| | | | | | | | 3074 |

Chi-square = 6.50. NS

CS

| Opinion | Bachelor's or less | Less than master's | Master's | Adv. cert. or less | More than adv. cert. | Total | N |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Yes | 8.4 | 29.7 | 35.0 | 20.6 | 6.3 | 100 | 505 |
| No | 17.4 | 30.7 | 32.8 | 13.8 | 6.3 | 100 | 397 |
| | | | | | | | 902 |

Chi-square = 22.16. P < .001

SI (spring)

| Opinion | Bachelor's or less | Less than master's | Master's | Adv. cert. or less | More than adv. cert. | Total | N |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Yes | 14.5 | 18.3 | 25.9 | 28.5 | 12.8 | 100 | 344 |
| No | 17.3 | 23.5 | 19.5 | 30.1 | 9.6 | 100 | 272 |
| | | | | | | | 616 |

Chi-square = 6.95. NS

Table III-9. Relation between general education and opinion on how many kinds of tests should be administered, in the three samples.

SSA

| No. of kinds | Bachelor's or less | Less than master's | Master's | Adv. cert. or less | More than adv. cert. | Total | N |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| All 6 | 17.1 | 22.4 | 31.5 | 18.8 | 10.2 | 100 | 1301 |
| 3-5 | 23.1 | 23.4 | 28.6 | 15.6 | 9.3 | 100 | 1014 |
| 0-2 | 18.6 | 20.8 | 32.5 | 19.3 | 8.8 | 100 | 1137 |
| | | | | | | | 3452 |

Chi-square = 21.35. P < .01

CS

| No. of kinds | Bachelor's or less | Less than master's | Master's | Adv. cert. or less | More than adv. cert. | Total | N |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| All 6 | 7.2 | 27.9 | 34.5 | 23.1 | 7.3 | 100 | 377 |
| 3-5 | 15.6 | 29.1 | 35.3 | 14.4 | 5.6 | 100 | 436 |
| 0-2 | 16.5 | 42.2 | 24.8 | 11.0 | 5.5 | 100 | 109 |
| | | | | | | | 922 |

Chi-square = 36.50. P < .001

SI (spring)

| No. of kinds | Bachelor's or less | Less than master's | Master's | Adv. cert. or less | More than adv. cert. | Total | N |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| All 6 | 13.7 | 13.7 | 28.2 | 29.4 | 15.0 | 100 | 262 |
| 3-5 | 18.0 | 24.4 | 17.1 | 31.6 | 8.9 | 100 | 316 |
| 0-2 | 9.5 | 35.7 | 33.3 | 14.3 | 7.2 | 100 | 42 |
| | | | | | | | 620 |

Chi-square = 34.34. P < .001

Table III-10. Relation between number of courses in testing and test attitude ABC, in the three samples.

SSA

| | Courses | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Attitude | None | 1 | 2 | ≥ 3 | Total | N |
| A | 16.8 | 32.1 | 28.6 | 22.5 | 100 | 1372 |
| B | 19.5 | 36.9 | 25.8 | 18.6 | 100 | 1761 |
| C | 30.7 | 39.2 | 20.3 | 9.8 | 100 | 153 |
| | | | | | | 3286 |

Chi-square = 40.35. P < .001

CS

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| A | 13.5 | 32.0 | 26.9 | 27.6 | 100 | 297 |
| B | 13.2 | 28.9 | 30.9 | 27.0 | 100 | 547 |
| C | 15.1 | 26.4 | 37.8 | 20.7 | 100 | 53 |
| | | | | | | 897 |

Chi-square = 3.86. NS

SI (1959)

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| A | 27.6 | 33.5 | 19.5 | 19.4 | 100 | 185 |
| B | 17.5 | 30.1 | 26.5 | 25.9 | 100 | 309 |
| C | 23.1 | 36.5 | 17.3 | 23.1 | 100 | 52 |
| | | | | | | 546 |

Chi-square = 11.87. .05 < P < .10

Table III-11. Relation between number of courses in testing and reported frequency of discussing test results with parents, in the three samples.

SSA

| Freq. of discussion | Courses None | 1 | 2 | ≥ 3 | Total | N |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Frequently | 11.6 | 23.7 | 24.9 | 39.8 | 100 | 630 |
| Sometimes | 14.8 | 32.5 | 30.5 | 22.2 | 100 | 1382 |
| Rarely | 23.1 | 40.8 | 24.5 | 11.6 | 100 | 901 |
| Never | 33.7 | 43.6 | 17.0 | 5.7 | 100 | 436 |
| | | | | | | 3349 |

Chi-square = 358.03. P < .001

CS

| Freq. of discussion | None | 1 | 2 | ≥ 3 | Total | N |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Frequently | 4.7 | 9.4 | 28.1 | 57.8 | 100 | 64 |
| Sometimes | 7.7 | 27.2 | 29.8 | 35.3 | 100 | 235 |
| Rarely | 11.9 | 30.4 | 32.7 | 25.0 | 100 | 260 |
| Never | 19.4 | 33.6 | 28.1 | 18.9 | 100 | 324 |
| | | | | | | 883 |

Chi-square = 66.90. P < .001

SI (spring)

| Freq. of discussion | None | 1 | 2 | ≥ 3 | Total | N |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Frequently | 2.1 | 15.5 | 40.2 | 42.2 | 100 | 97 |
| Sometimes | 13.6 | 23.4 | 32.6 | 30.4 | 100 | 184 |
| Rarely | 21.3 | 34.4 | 31.9 | 12.4 | 100 | 160 |
| Never | 31.6 | 34.2 | 25.9 | 8.3 | 100 | 158 |
| | | | | | | 599 |

Chi-square = 91.29. P < .001

Table III-12. Relation between number of courses in testing and reported frequency of discussing test results with students, in the three samples.

SSA

| Freq. of discussion | Courses<br>None | <br>1 | <br>2 | <br>≥ 3 | Total | N |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Frequently | 12.6 | 23.3 | 25.8 | 38.3 | 100 | 907 |
| Sometimes | 16.9 | 36.9 | 28.5 | 17.7 | 100 | 1535 |
| Rarely | 24.8 | 42.3 | 24.2 | 8.7 | 100 | 596 |
| Never | 36.4 | 39.4 | 19.0 | 5.2 | 100 | 327 |
| | | | | | | 3365 |

Chi-square = 433.74. P < .001

CS

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Frequently | 3.3 | 17.4 | 28.9 | 50.4 | 100 | 121 |
| Sometimes | 10.6 | 28.2 | 30.1 | 31.1 | 100 | 312 |
| Rarely | 12.9 | 34.1 | 33.2 | 19.8 | 100 | 217 |
| Never | 21.8 | 32.6 | 27.2 | 18.4 | 100 | 239 |
| | | | | | | 889 |

Chi-square = 68.47. P < .001

SI (spring)

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Frequently | 6.7 | 17.9 | 37.3 | 38.1 | 100 | 134 |
| Sometimes | 13.0 | 29.0 | 31.0 | 27.0 | 100 | 200 |
| Rarely | 23.3 | 34.7 | 30.0 | 12.0 | 100 | 150 |
| Never | 36.1 | 31.1 | 26.9 | 5.9 | 100 | 119 |
| | | | | | | 603 |

Chi-square = 84.44. P < .001

Table III-13. Relation between number of courses in testing and opinion on whether academic aptitude tests should be administered, in the three samples.

SSA

| | Courses | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Opinion | None | 1 | 2 | ≥ 3 | Total | N |
| Yes | 19.5 | 36.0 | 25.5 | 19.0 | 100 | 2174 |
| No | 19.4 | 32.9 | 26.6 | 21.1 | 100 | 870 |
| | | | | | | 3044 |

Chi-square = 3.56. NS

CS

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Yes | 12.9 | 29.5 | 29.7 | 27.9 | 100 | 777 |
| No | 16.9 | 29.2 | 31.5 | 22.4 | 100 | 130 |
| | | | | | | 907 |

Chi-square = 2.74. NS

SI (spring)

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Yes | 18.0 | 27.8 | 32.5 | 21.7 | 100 | 532 |
| No | 22.2 | 30.9 | 24.7 | 22.2 | 100 | 81 |
| | | | | | | 613 |

Chi-square = 2.25. NS

Table III-14. Relation between number of courses in testing and opinion on whether tests of achievement in subject fields should be administered, in the three samples.

SSA

| Opinion | Courses<br>None | 1 | 2 | ≥ 3 | Total | N |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Yes | 18.7 | 36.1 | 25.6 | 19.6 | 100 | 2109 |
| No | 21.2 | 32.9 | 26.3 | 19.6 | 100 | 935 |
| | | | | | | 3044 |

Chi-square = 5.84. NS

CS

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Yes | 12.6 | 29.2 | 29.5 | 28.7 | 100 | 689 |
| No | 16.0 | 30.3 | 31.7 | 22.0 | 100 | 218 |
| | | | | | | 907 |

Chi-square = 4.53. NS

SI (spring)

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Yes | 17.6 | 27.6 | 31.7 | 23.1 | 100 | 489 |
| No | 22.6 | 30.6 | 30.6 | 16.2 | 100 | 124 |
| | | | | | | 613 |

Chi-square = 3.89. NS

Table III-15. Relation between number of courses in testing and opinion on whether tests of achievement in reading should be administered, in the three samples.

SSA

| | Courses | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Opinion | None | 1 | 2 | ≥ 3 | Total | N |
| Yes | 19.2 | 35.7 | 25.7 | 19.4 | 100 | 2230 |
| No | 20.1 | 33.7 | 26.2 | 20.0 | 100 | 814 |
| | | | | | | 3044 |

Chi-square = 1.15. NS

CS

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Yes | 13.8 | 29.6 | 29.8 | 27.8 | 100 | 727 |
| No | 12.2 | 30.6 | 32.8 | 24.4 | 100 | 180 |
| | | | | | | 907 |

Chi-square = 1.51. NS

SI (spring)

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Yes | 19.1 | 27.0 | 31.1 | 22.8 | 100 | 544 |
| No | 14.5 | 37.7 | 34.8 | 13.0 | 100 | 69 |
| | | | | | | 613 |

Chi-square = 6.12. NS

2

Table III-16. Relation between number of courses in testing and opinion whether interest tests should be administered, in the three samples.

SSA

| Opinion | Courses | | | | Total | N |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | None | 1 | 2 | ≥ 3 | | |
| Yes | 19.1 | 34.2 | 26.7 | 20.0 | 100 | 2314 |
| No | 20.7 | 38.1 | 22.7 | 18.5 | 100 | 730 |
| | | | | | | 3044 |

Chi-square = 7.00. $.05 < P < .10$

CS

| Opinion | None | 1 | 2 | ≥ 3 | Total | N |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Yes | 12.7 | 26.9 | 28.9 | 31.5 | 100 | 629 |
| No | 15.1 | 35.2 | 32.4 | 17.3 | 100 | 278 |
| | | | | | | 907 |

Chi-square = 20.55. $P < .001$

SI (spring)

| Opinion | None | 1 | 2 | ≥ 3 | Total | N |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Yes | 16.0 | 28.5 | 32.3 | 23.2 | 100 | 474 |
| No | 27.3 | 27.3 | 28.8 | 16.6 | 100 | 139 |
| | | | | | | 613 |

Chi-square = 9.70. $P < .025$

**Table III-17.** Relation between number of courses in testing and opinion whether personality tests should be administered, in the three samples.

**SSA**

| Opinion | Courses<br>None | <br>1 | <br>2 | <br>≥ 3 | Total | N |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Yes | 19.1 | 35.2 | 28.7 | 21.9 | 100 | 2161 |
| No | 22.5 | 39.1 | 21.9 | 16.5 | 100 | 883 |
| | | | | | | 3044 |

Chi-square = 25.02. $P < .001$

**CS**

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Yes | 12.4 | 29.2 | 27.8 | 29.6 | 100 | 517 |
| No | 14.9 | 29.7 | 31.5 | 23.9 | 100 | 390 |
| | | | | | | 907 |

Chi-square = 4.26. NS

**SI** (spring)

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Yes | 17.0 | 27.0 | 32.0 | 24.0 | 100 | 341 |
| No | 20.6 | 29.8 | 30.9 | 18.7 | 100 | 272 |
| | | | | | | 613 |

Chi-square = 3.45. NS

Table III-18. Relation between number of courses in testing and opinion on how many kinds of tests should be administered, in the three samples.

SSA

| No. of kinds | Courses |  |  |  | Total | N |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
|  | None | 1 | 2 | ≥ 3 |  |  |
| All 6 | 16.7 | 35.0 | 26.8 | 21.5 | 100 | 1290 |
| 3-5 | 23.5 | 35.4 | 24.7 | 16.4 | 100 | 998 |
| 0-2 | 18.1 | 33.3 | 26.2 | 22.4 | 100 | 1125 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | 3413 |

Chi-square = 27.10. P < .001

CS

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| All 6 | 14.7 | 34.9 | 34.2 | 16.2 | 100 | 307 |
| 3-5 | 15.5 | 33.3 | 33.1 | 18.1 | 100 | 387 |
| 0-2 | 17.3 | 31.6 | 39.8 | 11.3 | 100 | 98 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | 792 |

Chi-square = 3.16. NS

SI (spring)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| All 6 | 14.3 | 26.7 | 31.8 | 27.2 | 100 | 258 |
| 3-5 | 22.7 | 27.8 | 30.9 | 18.6 | 100 | 317 |
| 0-2 | 12.2 | 43.9 | 34.1 | 9.8 | 100 | 41 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | 616 |

Chi-square = 17.92. P < .01

Table III-19. Summary of Tables III-1 through 18 concerning relations in the three samples between training and other variables. Entries in the body of the table are probability values computed by chi-square. "NS" means P > .05.

| | | Training variable | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | General education | | | No. of courses in testing | | |
| Table | Other variable | SSA | CS | SI | SSA | CS | SI |
| 1, 10 | Test attitude ABC | <.001(a) | NS (a) | NS | <.001(a) | NS | NS |
| 2, 11 | Test discussion with parents | <.001(b) | <.001(b) | <.001(b) | <.001(b) | <.001(b) | <.001(b) |
| 3, 12 | Test disc. with students | <.001(b) | <.001(b) | <.001(b) | <.001(b) | <.001(b) | <.001(b) |
| 4, 13 | Should acad. apt. tests....? | NS | NS (c) | <.001(c) | NS | NS | NS |
| 5, 14 | Achieve. in subj. fields...? | NS (c) | <.001(c) | <.01 (c) | NS | NS | NS |
| 6, 15 | Should achieve. in reading.? | NS | <.05 (c) | <.05 (c) | NS | NS | NS |
| 7, 16 | Should interest tests......? | NS | <.01 (c) | <.01 (c) | NS (c) | <.001(c) | <.025(c) |
| 8, 17 | Should personality tests...? | NS | <.001(c) | NS | <.001(c) | NS | NS |
| 9, 18 | How many kinds of tests....? | <.01 (d) | <.001(e) | <.001(d) | <.001(d) | NS | <.01 (d) |

(a) Least training accompanies attitude "C."
(b) More discussion with more training.
(c) More "yes" with more training.
(d) More kinds of tests desired with most training, but an intermediate number of kinds desired with least training.
(e) More kinds desired with more training.

Table III-20. Comparisons of relations in the three samples between general education and other variables. Interaction chi-square was obtained by the Lancaster method. "NS" means $P > .05$.

Key: A: sample: SSA, CS, or SI.
B: general education.
C: variable listed below.

| | BC | | | AC | | | AB | | | Interaction | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| C-variable | Chi-square | df | P | Chi-square | df | P | Chi-square | df | P | Chi-square | df | P |
| Test attitude ABC | 11.67 | 8 | NS | 26.63 | 4 | <.001 | 91.91 | 8 | <.001 | 50.10 | 16 | <.001 |
| Test discussion with parents | 97.06 | 12 | <.001 | 264.04 | 6 | <.001 | 86.36 | 8 | <.001 | 37.43 | 24 | NS |
| Test discussion with students | 102.96 | 12 | <.001 | 223.20 | 6 | <.001 | 91.41 | 8 | <.001 | 66.21 | 24 | <.001 |
| Should interest tests be administered? | 14.87 | 4 | <.01 | 29.22 | 2 | <.001 | 88.49 | 8 | <.001 | 10.98 | 8 | NS |

Table III-21. Comparison of relations in the three samples between number of courses in testing and other variables. Interaction chi-square was obtained by the Lancaster method. "NS" means P > .05.

Key: A: sample: SSA, CS, or SI.
B: number of courses in testing.
C: variable listed below.

| | BC | | | AC | | | AB | | | Interaction | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| C-variable | Chi-square | df | P | Chi-square | df | P | Chi-square | df | P | Chi-square | df | P |
| Test attitude ABC | 7.01 | 6 | NS | 25.31 | 4 | <.001 | 102.92 | 6 | <.001 | 25.96 | 12 | <.02 |
| Test discussion with parents | 103.51 | 9 | <.001 | 266.56 | 6 | <.001 | 95.18 | 6 | <.001 | 31.45 | 18 | <.05 |
| Test discussion with students | 126.67 | 9 | <.001 | 216.36 | 6 | <.001 | 93.27 | 6 | <.001 | 17.70 | 18 | NS |
| Should interest tests be administered? | 16.53 | 3 | <.001 | 28.82 | 2 | <.001 | 99.14 | 6 | <.001 | 12.42 | 6 | NS |

# CHAPTER IV

## EFFECTS OF INSTITUTES IN GUIDANCE AND TESTING

Project 702 (SI) was devoted entirely to one particular summer institute in guidance and testing and to the faculties of the schools to which the trainees returned. For a precise comparison of the outcomes of this institute with outcomes of other institutes, it would have been necessary to invest the same amount of time and money multiplied by the number of institutes to be compared with the first. Money was not available for a study on such a grand scale. Yet it seemed valuable to compare attitudes and practices in the SI schools not only with schools which had sent no one to such a training institute during the same period, but also with schools which had sent personnel to other institutes. The method which we used to locate schools containing faculty members recently returned from institutes roughly comparable to the summer institute of the University of Illinois was very imprecise, but also very inexpensive.

As we mentioned in Chapter I, we sent letters with enclosed post cards to the principal of every high school in the state enrolling more than one hundred students and asked how many members of the faculty had attended "an institute in guidance, counseling, testing, and/or measurement during the period June 1959 to September 1960." This gave us information, of course, about the schools in all three of our samples. For purposes of the present analysis, each school in the CS and SSA samples was put into one of three training classifications: (1) schools which sent more than one person to an institute during the designated period, (2) schools which sent one person, (3) schools which sent no one. Some statistics concerning these three classifications in the CS study are shown in Table IV-1. The schools of the SI sample, of course, all sent at least one person to an institute and some sent several. However, because we were interested in the effects of the institute in which the SI schools participated in common, we did not apply the above categories to the SI schools; they will be considered as a separate group. In other words, our analysis made use of various subgroups; the SSA and CS schools divided into the three training classifications listed just above and the SI schools taken as a single group.

To explore the question whether sending faculty members to institutes had any effect on their colleagues, we looked within the three CS training classifications at the distributions of responses to other variables. To assess the relative effects of the Illinois Summer Institute of 1959, we compared the SI responses to the responses within the three CS subsamples. To see whether the relations between institute training and other variables changed over the period of a year, we compared the relations in the SSA sample with the relations in the CS sample. We shall begin with the first two of these questions, using the CS and SI samples, and leave the SSA sample for discussion later.

## Relations between Frequency of Institute Training and Other Variables

Comparisons of the three training classifications within the CS sample in respect to other variables are given by Tables IV-2 through 30. In these tables, a percentage of response within one CS subsample which is proportionately heavier than the percentages of response in the other CS subsamples is enclosed in parentheses. (The underlining in these tables will be explained later.) The comparisons of the CS subsamples in Tables IV-2 through 30 are summarized in Table IV-31 under the heading, "Comparisons of CS subsamples."

The first thing notable in Table IV-31 is that out of 22 earlier tables summarized only six showed a significant relation within the CS sample between training category and other variables. Two of the variables examined (Items 2 and 3 in Table IV-31) were level of education and number of courses in testing. Particularly in the case of courses in testing, some of the relation with training category was no doubt due to the fact that a member of the faculty attending an institute raised slightly the mean number of "courses" in the school; the differences among means shown in Table IV-3 might all have been produced in this manner. This kind of contamination, presumably, occurred only negligibly in the case of level of education; in any case, the differences shown in the note under Table IV-2 are too great to have been accounted for by replies which counted an institute as "semester hours." This disproportionate attendance at training institutes by persons from schools having higher mean levels of education seems reasonable; no doubt such schools foster the pursuit of further education, including that obtainable at institutes. The point here is that the different mean levels of education among the CS subsamples is surely not one which would have been produced by attendance at institutes by one or two members of the faculty in the period between the two measurements.

In Item 11 of Table IV-31 we note that the CS(> 1)[*] schools, more frequently than the other subsamples, preferred a more informative and ready-for-use method of conveying test results to teachers. In Item 12, on the other hand, we see that the CS(> 1) schools less frequently preferred to learn about test results in small group meetings. Taking these two items together, they give no persuasive evidence that views about the dissemination of test results to teachers were influenced by faculty members who attended institutes.

Item 21 indicates that the CS schools sending more persons to institutes tended to refer more students for counseling concerning academic problems than did other CS schools; Item 22 indicates that the same was true in regard to referring students for disciplinary counseling. In these respects, it may be that the institute trainees were influential at least in the sense that they became more visible as places for the teachers to send their problem-students.

In all, there is very sparse evidence in Table IV-31 under the heading "Comparisons of CS subsamples" that different perceptions or practices occurred in schools which had sent members to guidance institutes, compared to schools which had not. The story becomes very different, however, when we turn to a comparison of the SI schools with the CS subsamples.

---

[*] See Table IV-1 for explanation of this symbolism.

## Relations between Training at the Illinois Institute and Other Variables

Distributions of responses from the SI sample are tabulated in Tables IV-2 through 30 along with the distributions from the CS subsamples. The underlined percentages in the tables show the response categories which are disproportionately heavy when all four groups are taken into account: the three CS training categories and the SI sample. These results are summarized in Table IV-31 under the heading, "Comparisons of SI with CS."

A glance at Table IV-31 shows that many more of the relations become significant when the SI sample is compared with the CS subsamples. In nine instances, in fact, relations were significant when all four groups were considered which had not been significant within the CS subsamples only. This result suggests that the SI sample differed from the CS sample, in general, more than the CS training classifications differed from each other.

In comparison to the CS subsamples, members of the SI schools (1) had a higher mean level of education, (2) were more satisfied with the information in their files about students, (3) more frequently discussed test results with students, parents, and other teachers, (4) more frequently preferred to transmit test results to teachers in informative and helpful ways, and (5) referred more students to counselors for all purposes except discipline; here they referred fewer.

Some of these results need further comment. Let us turn first to the findings on number of students referred to counselors. Tables IV-18 through 22 tabulate the number of students which teachers and administrators reported sending to counselors; Tables IV-23 through 27 show the number of students which counselors reported having been referred to them by other faculty members. The results in these two sets of tables are in harmony; the two sets of respondents corroborated each other in the finding that SI teachers and administrators in general referred more students to counselors than did CS personnel, but that in the case of disciplinary problems the SI faculties referred fewer students to the counselors.

In regard to Item 22 of Table IV-31, the SI sample did not differ from the CS sample as a whole when both teachers and administrators entered the computations. However, when only the responses of teachers were considered (see Table II-52), the number of students reported sent to the counselor for disciplinary reasons was significantly less in the SI sample than in the CS sample. Counselors (see Table IV-27) concurred in this result, even though the question (Appendix, Section I, Item 19) we addressed to them made no distinction between referrals from teachers and administrators.

Almost all of the differences we have set forth between the SI and CS samples are differences which, surely, the instructors in the University of Illinois summer institute would applaud. Even the higher satisfaction of the SI sample with the information about students in the school files might have resulted from the SI respondents using the information more, understanding it better, and consequently finding it more often answering their purposes.

The one finding which seems troublesome is that given in Tables IV-28 through 30, the finding that the SI sample, both in fall 1959 and in fall 1960, had less agreement with the experts (the instructors of the SI institute!) on the counselor's appropriate role than did any of the CS subsamples in fall 1960. Since the other findings of this chapter argue that the schools of the SI sample were affected in directions consistent with the goals of the instructors in the University of Illinois summer institute, this particular finding of comparative disagreement with the experts on the counselor's appropriate role seems odd. Chance agreement on the instrument used would have been an agreement score of 8-1/3. The main agreement scores for the two samples (above 15 for the SI and above 16 for the CS) are both well above the chance figure and, considering the maximum possible score of 25, are not greatly different from each other in a practical sense. The only explanation which has occurred to us so far is that the heightened activity and thinking in regard to counseling and testing in the SI schools may have produced a certain minority opinion opposed to the direction taken by the trainees of the Illinois institute. Perhaps the minority opinion lay chiefly with administrators and other counselors; Table IX-12 of the Project 702 report showed that these groups possibly influenced the institute trainee rather than vice versa.

All in all, the results summarized in Table IV-31 argue that the SI sample was remarkably different from the CS sample, at least in the respects our variables mirror. Not only did the SI sample differ from the CS sample in many cases where the CS training classifications did not differ from each other, but sometimes a difference between CS training classifications carried even more strongly into the SI sample. In one case (sending students to the counselor for disciplinary reasons), the SI responses tended in a direction opposite to the tendency found among the CS subsamples, and the direction of the SI responses was a direction the SI institute instructors would have recommended. Furthermore, one can see by scanning the tables that, in most of the cases where the SI sample was "superior" to the CS sample, the SI sample was superior even to the CS(1) and CS(> 1) subsamples.

Since the CS sample was picked randomly and since the SI was picked only by the fact that the SI schools had sent a faculty member to the University of Illinois summer institute of 1959, the best explanation (or at least the most ready explanation) of these findings is that the summer institute was primarily responsible for the differences.

This conclusion may seem at first glance to be at odds with the conclusions put forward about the effects of the University of Illinois summer institute in Chapters IX and X in the report of Project 702. In those chapters, which looked at changes in the definition of the role of the counselor and at preferences concerning the dissemination of test results, data were offered to show that the SI sample as a whole had not changed over the period of a year in regard to those matters. To recapitulate, Chapter II gave evidence that opinions and practices in faculties over the state as a whole remained stable except for certain items which might have been susceptible to the Hawthorne effect of the search for talent. Chapters II and III together argued that the SI sample was a representative one, except for some items which might have been influenced by the summer institute trainee. And Chapter IX of the 702 report showed little change on the part of the SI schools as a whole.

Now, taking these results as they are stated here, albeit too simply, and forgetting the exceptions for the moment, it might seem that the SI sample should not have differed from the CS, the argument running that the SI schools and the CS schools were both representative, that representative schools were stable, and that we have the direct evidence from Project 702 of no change in the SI schools.

However, there were some changes and differences. The "exceptions" noted above are exactly the items on which the SI sample became different from the CS sample. Furthermore, a strict syllogism cannot be constructed from the conclusions of the various chapters in this report, since the items examined are not the same from chapter to chapter. Similarly, the findings of Chapters IX and X in the report on Project 702 are not directly comparable with the findings we have reported here. Agreement with the SI summer institute trainee on the counselor's role, extensively treated in Chapter IX of Project 702, is not to be found any place in Table IV-31. Agreement with the SI trainee on the dissemination of test results, treated in Chapter IX of Project 702, is not treated directly in the present chapter, but opinions about dissemination of test results (without regard to whether those opinions agree with the trainee's) are presented in Tables IV-9 through 17. It is to be noted that the tables here which deal with the dissemination of test results to parents and students (Tables IV-13 through 17) are tables which indeed showed no difference between the SI and the CS samples; the same data from the SI sample composed a large part of the index which was studied in Chapter X of Project 702 where no change over a year's period was demonstrated on the part of the SI schools as a total group. In other words, where the data of this present chapter overlap those of the report on Project 702, the results are reasonably consistent; where the data in the present chapter go beyond the data used in Project 702 (as, for example, the data concerning referrals of students to the counselor), impressive differences between the SI and the CS appear. The new differences in this chapter have chiefly to do with frequency of discussing test results with parents, students, and teachers; with the manner of disseminating test results to teachers (though not to parents and students); and with the referral of students to the counselor.

The reader may also be perplexed in comparing the results in Chapter III with those in this chapter. In Chapter III relations between training and other variables were examined in the SI and CS samples and only minor differences were found. In the present chapter, we are arguing that training in a particular guidance institute made a remarkable difference.

There is no conflict here. Chapter III examined the relation between training and other variables by assessing the training of each individual and comparing the relation in the total CS sample with the relation in the SI sample. In Chapter IV, on the other hand, we have neither assessed the training of individuals nor dealt with mean training levels in schools. We have divided schools into categories according to whether they sent one or more members to guidance institutes. We have then compared the distributions of other variables across these "training" categories of schools, pooling the responses of all individuals from all schools within any one "training" category. The relations between individual training and other variables (as well as the similarity of those relations in the two samples) can continue to exist within the "training" categories defined by sending members to institutes.

## Changes Over a Year's Time in Relations between Training in Institutes and Other Variables

Up to this point we have compared the effects on the SI schools of sending members to the Illinois institute, on the one hand, with the effects on randomly chosen schools (CS) of sending members to unknown institutes, on the other hand. We shall now leave this topic and return to the examination of stability of opinion and practice among faculties in Illinois high schools. To do this, we shall again compare only the SSA and the CS samples, as we did in Chapter II, Tables II-53 through 55. Accepting these two samples as adequately random samples taken about a year and a half apart, their comparison gives a measure of the stability in the responses of the population of Illinois high school faculties. In Chapter II, these two samples were compared in respect to their responses to single variables; in Chapter III (Tables III-20 and 21) they were compared along with the SI sample in respect to relations between training and other variables; in this chapter the two will again be compared in respect to the relations between variables which they exhibited. This time the relations to be examined are those between training classifications (how many members the school sent to guidance institutes) and certain other variables.

The SSA schools were divided by training classification in the same way as the CS schools, and the responses within these classifications were distributed on other variables which were common to the two samples. The resulting relations are compared, one sample against the other, in Table IV-32.

The "interaction" section of Table IV-32 shows that no significant difference was found, using Lancaster's* method, between the relations in 1959 (SSA) and in 1960 (CS). That is, whatever the relation in 1959 between the training classification of the school and the C-variable listed at the left of Table IV-32, the shape of the relation was substantially the same in 1960. The training classification of the school, it will be remembered, was made on the basis of whether the school had sent a member to a guidance institute during the period June 1959 to September 1960. The SSA data were gathered prior to June 1959 and the CS data after September 1960. In other words, the SSA data were gathered before any member of the school received the training by which the school was classified, and the CS data were gathered after the training had been undergone. The non-significant interactions, consequently, mean that the institute training given to the individuals from the CS schools did not bring about distributions of faculty responses differing from the responses of faculties in comparable schools before the institute training was received.* Put very simply, the institute training in the CS schools had no effect on the C-variables listed in Table IV-32. This result was not unexpected, but it serves to give added confidence in the adequacy of the sampling at both times.

---

*Op. cit.

It may help in interpreting Table IV-32 to point out some correspondences between certain sections of Table IV-32 and earlier tables. The "BC" section of the table combines the SSA and the CS samples and shows the relation between the training classifications of the school and responses of faculty members in respect to the variables listed at the left. Within the CS sample only, relations between general education, number of courses in testing, test discussion with parents, and test discussion with students on the one hand and the training classification of the school on the other hand were shown in Tables IV-2, 3, 5, and 6. The pattern of significance in those tables is the same as the pattern for the SSA and CS samples combined and shown in Table IV-32.

The results in the "AC" section of Table IV-32 show that the SSA and CS samples differed in distribution of responses to the variables listed at the left. These results are consistent with Tables II-1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 10.

Section "AB" of the table shows that the two samples differed somewhat in the proportions of persons found in schools which had sent varying numbers of persons to institutes.** The CS sample had a few more people, relatively, in schools sending persons to institutes than did the SSA sample. It should not be supposed that this results from the passage of a year's time, since the training classification in both samples was defined by attendance at institutes during the same period. No ready explanation occurs to us for this difference; it may be due to sampling variability.

---

*More precisely, data were gathered from three groups (training classifications) of the SSA schools. About a year and a half later, after schools in certain of these groups had sent members to guidance institutes, a sub-set of these schools (namely, the CS schools) was randomly selected and data on the same variables was obtained from them; it was then found that the distributions of responses in the training categories had not significantly altered. It should be mentioned that the individuals responding at the two times did not greatly overlap, since far greater proportions of faculties were sampled in 1960 and some faculty members from the 1959 sample would have dropped out.

**Since the C-variable is ignored in the AB section of this table, the figures in every line of the AB section would be identical were it not for the slightly varying N from line to line caused by occasional persons who failed to respond to one or more of the C-variables.

Table IV-1. Composition of CS sub-samples; percentages of teachers, counselors, and administrators and numbers of schools and individuals in each of three training classifications.

| Symbol | Classification | Teachers | Counselors | Administrators | Total | N |  |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
|  |  |  |  |  |  | Schools | Individuals |
| CS(> 1) | Schools which sent more than one person to an institute in guidance, counseling, testing, and/or measurement during the period June 1959 to September 1960. | 90.2 | 4.5 | 5.3 | 100 | 14 | 357 |
| CS(1) | Schools which sent one person to such an institute. | 91.3 | 3.7 | 5.0 | 100 | 16 | 356 |
| CS(0) | Schools which sent no one to such an institute. | 90.8 | 1.4 | 7.8 | 100 | 17 | 218 |
| CS | Total | 90.8 | 3.4 | 5.8 | 100 | 47 | 931 |

Table IV-2. Distribution of general education in SI sample and three CS training classifications. Entries in body of table are percentages. Underlined percentages are greater than expected from marginal totals. Percentages in parentheses are greater than expected from marginal totals when only the CS sub-samples are considered.

| Sample | Bachelor's or less | Less than master's | Master's | Adv. cert. or less | More than adv. cert. | Total | N |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| SI(spring) | 15.7 | 20.7 | 22.8 | 29.6 | 11.2 | 100 | 619 |
| CS(> 1) | 11.5 | 27.2 | 33.4 | (19.4) | (8.5) | 100 | 356 |
| CS(1) | 9.9 | 29.6 | (34.6) | (19.4) | 6.5 | 100 | 355 |
| CS(0) | (17.5) | (35.0) | 33.2 | 12.0 | 2.3 | 100 | 217 |
| | | | | | | | 1547 |

Chi-square = 85.29. P < .001
For CS sub-samples, chi-square = 23.10. P < .005
Mean number of semester hours past the bachelor's degree:

| | |
|---|---|
| SI(spring) | 30.8 |
| CS(> 1) | 28.0 |
| CS(1) | 27.0 |
| CS(0) | 21.1 |

Table IV-3. Distribution of number of courses in testing in SI sample and three CS training classifications.

| Sample | Courses: None | 1 | 2 | ≥ 3 | Total | N | Mean courses |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| SI(spring) | 18.5 | 28.5 | 31.4 | 21.6 | 100 | 615 | 1.56 |
| CS(> 1) | 12.9 | 24.2 | (32.9) | (30.0) | 100 | 350 | 1.80 |
| CS(1) | (14.9) | 28.4 | 26.7 | (30.0) | 100 | 348 | 1.72 |
| CS(0) | 12.6 | (39.1) | 30.2 | 18.1 | 100 | 215 | 1.54 |
| | | | | | | 1528 | |

Chi-square = 32.13. P < .001
For CS sub-samples, chi-square = 21.55. P < .01

Table IV-4. Answers to question whether information school obtains and files about students is sufficient, in SI sample and three CS training classifications.

| Sample | Files sufficient? | | | Total | N |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Yes | No | Uncertain | | |
| SI(spring) | 64.5 | 19.5 | 16.0 | 100 | 619 |
| CS(> 1) | 59.1 | 22.6 | 18.3 | 100 | 350 |
| CS(1) | 67.2 | 16.8 | 16.0 | 100 | 351 |
| CS(0) | 49.8 | 28.4 | 21.8 | 100 | 215 |
| | | | | | 1535 |

Chi-square = 21.01. $P < .005$
For CS sub-samples, uncertain *vs.* yes or no (2 df),
chi-square = 3.23. NS

Table IV-5. Reported frequency of discussing test results with parents in SI sample and three CS training classifications.

| Sample | Discussion | | | | Total | N |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Never | Rarely | Sometimes | Frequently | | |
| SI(spring) | 26.1 | 26.4 | 31.2 | 16.3 | 100 | 606 |
| CS(> 1) | 35.3 | 26.9 | 28.6 | 9.2 | 100 | 346 |
| CS(1) | 38.0 | 31.1 | 25.1 | 5.8 | 100 | 347 |
| CS(0) | 34.8 | 31.9 | 26.6 | 6.7 | 100 | 207 |
| | | | | | | 1506 |

Chi-square = 47.87. $P < .001$
CS sub-samples NS

Table IV-6. Reported frequency of discussing test results with students in SI sample and three CS training classifications.

| | Discussion | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Sample | Never | Rarely | Some times | Fre- quently | Total | N |
| SI(spring) | 19.7 | 24.6 | 33.6 | 22.1 | 100 | 610 |
| CS(> 1) | 28.7 | 23.0 | 34.5 | 13.8 | 100 | 348 |
| CS(1) | 26.1 | 25.3 | 34.7 | 13.9 | 100 | 352 |
| CS(0) | 26.6 | 24.2 | 36.7 | 12.5 | 100 | 207 |
| | | | | | | 1517 |

Chi-square = 25.82. P < .001
CS sub-samples NS

Table IV-7. Distribution of TDS scores in the SI sample and three CS training classifications.

| | TDS score | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Sample | 0-2 | 3-4 | 5-6 | 7-9 | Total | N |
| SI(spring) | 23.9 | 23.0 | 29.2 | 23.9 | 100 | 416 |
| CS(> 1) | 31.1 | 26.5 | 24.8 | 17.6 | 100 | 401 |
| CS(1) | 27.6 | 29.9 | 29.9 | 12.6 | 100 | 437 |
| CS(0) | 28.2 | 27.8 | 29.2 | 14.8 | 100 | 287 |
| | | | | | | 1541 |

Chi-square = 28.48. P < .001
CS sub-samples NS

Table IV-8. Satisfaction with kinds of test administered in the school, in SI sample and three CS training classifications.

| Sample | 3 or more kinds desired than given | 2 more kinds desired than given | One more kind desired than given | Same kinds desired as given | More kinds given than desired | Total | N |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| SI(spring) | 9.5 | 15.2 | 22.6 | 30.8 | 21.9 | 100 | 597 |
| CS(> 1) | 15.2 | 11.9 | 18.5 | 27.5 | 26.9 | 100 | 335 |
| CS(1) | 11.1 | 15.2 | 19.0 | 32.1 | 22.6 | 100 | 343 |
| CS(0) | 14.4 | 19.1 | 19.1 | 23.4 | 24.0 | 100 | 209 |
| | | | | | | | 1484 |

Chi-square = 20.53. .05 < P < .10
CS sub-samples NS

Table IV-9. Answers in the SI sample and in three CS training classifications concerning test dissemination to teachers: should test scores be kept in an administrative office where any may look them up who wish?

| Sample | Yes | No | Total | N |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| SI(spring) | 56.6 | 43.4 | 100 | 603 |
| CS(> 1) | 56.6 | 43.4 | 100 | 355 |
| CS(1) | 69.9 | 30.1 | 100 | 355 |
| CS(0) | 58.3 | 41.7 | 100 | 216 |
| | | | | 1529 |

Chi-square = 19.00.
P < .001
CS sub-samples NS

Table IV-10. Answers in the SI sample and in three CS training classifications concerning test dissemination to teachers: should test scores be kept in a particular office where an appointed person will discuss the results with any teacher who asks?

| Sample | Yes | No | Total | N |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| SI(spring) | 61.4 | 38.6 | 100 | 603 |
| CS(> 1) | 53.2 | 46.8 | 100 | 355 |
| CS(1) | 49.3 | 50.7 | 100 | 355 |
| CS(0) | 50.9 | 49.1 | 100 | 216 |
| | | | | 1529 |

Chi-square = 16.28.
P < .005
For CS sub-samples,
chi-square = 1.10.
NS.

Table IV-11. Answers in the SI sample and in three CS training classifications concerning dissemination of test results to teachers: should test results in description form (not actual scores) be given to the teacher to keep?

| Sample | Yes | No | Total | N |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| SI(spring) | 31.8 | 68.2 | 100 | 603 |
| CS(> 1) | (29.6) | 70.4 | 100 | 355 |
| CS(1) | 20.8 | (79.2) | 100 | 355 |
| CS(0) | 26.4 | 73.6 | 100 | 216 |
| | | | | 1529 |

Chi-square = 13.97.
P < .005
For CS samples,
chi-square = 7.18.
P < .05

Table IV-12. Answers in the SI sample and in three CS training classifications concerning test dissemination to teachers: should group meetings be held at which test results are explained and discussed with teachers?

| Sample | Yes | No | Total | N |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| SI(spring) | 57.7 | 42.3 | 100 | 603 |
| CS(> 1) | 45.9 | (54.1) | 100 | 355 |
| CS(1) | (54.9) | 45.1 | 100 | 355 |
| CS(0) | (60.5) | 39.5 | 100 | 215 |
|  |  |  |  | 1528 |

Chi-square = 15.81.
P < .005
For CS sub-samples,
chi-square = 12.01.
P < .005

Table IV-13. Answers in the SI sample and in three CS training classifications concerning dissemination of test results to parents: should it be the practice that any parent who wishes may confer with the principal or guidance counselor and receive information about test results -- that teachers should not give such information?

| Sample | Yes | No | Total | N |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| SI(spring) | 76.2 | 23.8 | 100 | 621 |
| CS(> 1) | 73.1 | 26.9 | 100 | 327 |
| CS(1) | 74.1 | 25.9 | 100 | 332 |
| CS(0) | 77.6 | 22.4 | 100 | 196 |
|  |  |  |  | 1476 |

Chi-square = 2.05. NS.

CS sub-samples NS.

Table IV-14. Answers in the SI sample and in three CS training classifications concerning dissemination of test results to parents: should it be the practice that any parent who wishes may confer with any teacher and receive information about test results?

| Sample | Yes | No | Total | N |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| SI(spring) | 13.4 | 86.6 | 100 | 621 |
| CS(> 1) | 16.5 | 83.5 | 100 | 327 |
| CS(1) | 14.5 | 85.5 | 100 | 332 |
| CS(0) | 17.9 | 82.1 | 100 | 196 |
|  |  |  |  | 1476 |

Chi-square = 3.35. NS.

CS sub-samples NS.

Table IV-15. Answers in the SI sample and in three CS training classifications concerning test dissemination to parents: should it be the practice that parents whose children present academic or disciplinary problems are called in for conference and test results are used as part of the conference?

| Sample | Yes | No | Total | N |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| SI(spring) | 62.3 | 37.7 | 100 | 621 |
| CS(> 1) | 62.1 | 37.9 | 100 | 327 |
| CS(1) | 66.9 | 33.1 | 100 | 332 |
| CS(0) | 57.7 | 42.3 | 100 | 196 |
| | | | | 1476 |

Chi-square = 4.79. NS.

CS sub-samples NS.

Table IV-16. Answers in the SI sample and in three CS training classifications concerning test dissemination to students: should it be the practice that teachers discuss test results with students when the occasion arises or the need occurs -- this being largely at the discretion of the teacher?

| Sample | Yes | No | Total | N |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| SI(spring) | 40.4 | 59.6 | 100 | 616 |
| CS(> 1) | 36.2 | 63.8 | 100 | 323 |
| CS(1) | 39.8 | 60.2 | 100 | 332 |
| CS(0) | 45.0 | 55.0 | 100 | 202 |
| | | | | 1473 |

Chi-square = 3.99. NS.

CS sub-samples NS.

Table IV-17. Answers in the SI sample and in three CS training classifications concerning test dissemination to students: should it be the practice that counselors confer at certain times with students individually and discuss their test results in the context of the students' future plans?

| Sample | Yes | No | Total | N |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| SI(spring) | 90.7 | 9.3 | 100 | 616 |
| CS(> 1) | 87.3 | 12.7 | 100 | 323 |
| CS(1) | 84.9 | 15.1 | 100 | 332 |
| CS(0) | 88.1 | 11.9 | 100 | 202 |
| | | | | 1473 |

Chi-square = 7.37. NS.
$.05 < P < .10$
CS sub-samples NS.

Table IV-18. Number of students referred to counselor by other faculty members in the SI sample and three CS training classifications for vocational counseling.

| Sample | None | 1-9 | 10-up | Total | N |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| SI(1960) | 68.3 | 18.8 | 12.9 | 100 | 382 |
| CS(> 1) | 75.4 | 14.2 | 10.4 | 100 | 317 |
| CS(1) | 81.3 | 13.9 | 4.8 | 100 | 316 |
| CS(0) | 78.2 | 13.7 | 8.1 | 100 | 197 |
| | | | | | 1212 |

Chi-square = 20.31, $P < .005$.
For CS sub-samples, chi-square = 6.71. NS.

Table IV-19. Number of students referred to counselor by other faculty members in SI sample and three CS training classifications for educational counseling.

| Sample | None | 1-9 | 10-up | Total | N |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| SI(1960) | 60.2 | 19.5 | 20.3 | 100 | 349 |
| CS(> 1) | 70.7 | 15.5 | 13.8 | 100 | 304 |
| CS(1) | 72.7 | 15.9 | 11.4 | 100 | 315 |
| CS(0) | 78.1 | 13.0 | 8.9 | 100 | 192 |
| | | | | | 1160 |

Chi-square = 25.54, $P < .001$.
For CS sub-samples, chi-square = 3.75. NS.

Table IV-20. Number of students referred to counselor by other faculty members in SI sample and three CS training classifications for counseling concerning college goals.

| Sample | None | 1-9 | 10-up | Total | N |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| SI(1960) | 64.3 | 18.6 | 17.1 | 100 | 361 |
| CS(> 1) | 71.0 | 17.4 | 11.6 | 100 | 310 |
| CS(1) | 74.7 | 17.1 | 8.2 | 100 | 316 |
| CS(0) | 76.9 | 15.4 | 8.7 | 100 | 195 |
| | | | | | 1182 |

Chi-square = 17.95, $P < .01$.
For CS sub-samples, chi-square = 2.61. NS.

**Table IV-21.** Number of students referred to counselor by other faculty members in SI sample and three CS training classifications for counseling concerning academic problems.

| Sample | None | 1-9 | 10-up | Total | N |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| SI(1960) | 67.9 | 18.3 | 13.8 | 100 | 371 |
| CS(> 1) | 75.1 | (15.4) | (9.5) | 100 | 305 |
| CS(1) | 77.1 | (16.4) | 6.5 | 100 | 323 |
| CS(0) | (87.5) | 7.5 | 5.0 | 100 | 200 |
| | | | | | 1199 |

Chi-square = 32.17, P < .001.
For CS sub-samples, chi-square = 14.92, P < .005.

**Table IV-22.** Number of students referred to counselor by other faculty members in SI sample and three CS training classifications for counseling concerning disciplinary problems.

| Sample | None | 1-9 | 10-up | Total | N |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| SI(1960) | 72.6 | 20.0 | 7.4 | 100 | 376 |
| CS(> 1) | 69.0 | 18.3 | (12.7) | 100 | 306 |
| CS(1) | 71.1 | (24.2) | 4.7 | 100 | 322 |
| CS(0) | (86.3) | 9.6 | 4.1 | 100 | 197 |
| | | | | | 1201 |

Chi-square = 36.94, P < .001.
For CS sub-samples, chi-square = 36.50, P < .001.

**Table IV-23.** Number of student referrals from other faculty members for the purpose of vocational counseling reported by counselors in SI sample and in CS schools sending members to institutes.

| Sample | 0-3 | 4-30 | 31-up | Total | N |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| SI(1960) | 35.7 | 26.8 | 37.5 | 100 | 56 |
| CS(> 0) | 42.3 | 26.9 | 30.8 | 100 | 26 |
| | | | | | 82 |

Chi-square = 0.31. NS.

**Table IV-24.** Number of student referrals from other faculty members for educational counseling reported by counselors in SI sample and in CS schools sending members to institutes.

| Sample | 0-3 | 4-30 | 31-up | Total | N |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| SI(1960) | 17.0 | 24.5 | 58.5 | 100 | 53 |
| CS(> 0) | 42.3 | 15.4 | 42.3 | 100 | 26 |
| | | | | | 79 |

Chi-square = 4.76,
.05 < P < .10

Table IV-25. Number of student referrals from other faculty members concerning college goals reported by counselors in SI sample and in CS schools sending members to institutes.

| Sample | 0-3 | 4-30 | 31-up | Total | N |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| SI(1960) | 31.5 | 31.5 | 37.0 | 100 | 54 |
| CS(> 0) | 44.4 | 14.8 | 40.8 | 100 | 27 |
| | | | | | 81 |

Chi-square = 2.69

NS

Table IV-26. Number of student referrals from other faculty members concerning academic problems reported by counselors in SI sample and in CS schools sending members to institutes.

| Sample | 0-3 | 4-30 | 31-up | Total | N |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| SI(1960) | 11.8 | 47.0 | 41.2 | 100 | 51 |
| CS(> 0) | 41.7 | 20.8 | 37.5 | 100 | 24 |
| | | | | | 75 |

Chi-square = 10.00

$P < .01$

Table IV-27. Number of student referrals from other faculty members concerning discipline problems reported by counselors in SI sample and in CS schools sending members to institutes.

| Sample | 0-3 | 4-30 | 31-up | Total | N |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| SI(1960) | 36.4 | 47.3 | 16.3 | 100 | 55 |
| CS(> 0) | 39.1 | 13.0 | 47.9 | 100 | 23 |
| | | | | | 78 |

Chi-square = 10.27

$P < .01$

Table IV-28. Distribution of scores on agreement with experts on counselor's appropriate role in SI samples and in three CS training classifications. Entries in body of table are frequencies.

| Score on agreement with experts | Sample | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | SI fall 1959 | SI fall 1960 | CS (> 1) | CS (1) | CS (0) |
| 0-5 | 16 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 6-10 | 72 | 64 | 22 | 30 | 9 |
| 11-15 | 176 | 121 | 101 | 79 | 42 |
| 16-20 | 219 | 136 | 146 | 122 | 54 |
| 21-25 | 99 | 61 | 49 | 63 | 29 |
| Total | 582 | 391 | 318 | 294 | 134 |
| Mean | 15.6 | 15.2 | 16.5 | 16.7 | 16.7 |
| S.D. | 4.8 | 4.9 | 4.0 | 4.2 | 4.3 |

Table IV-29. Summary of analysis of variance comparing mean scores on agreement with experts on counselor's appropriate role in SI(fall 1959) sample and in the three CS training classifications.

| Source | SS | df | MS | F |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Means | 342 | 3 | 113.84 | F = 113.84/19.54 = 5.83 |
| Within | 25,868 | 1324 | 19.54 | $F_{.99}$ (3, 1324) = 3.80 |
| Total | 26,210 | 1327 | | |

Table IV-30. Summary of analysis of variance comparing mean scores on agreement with experts on counselor's appropriate role in SI(fall 1960) sample and in the three CS training classifications.

| Source | SS | df | MS | F |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Means | 544 | 3 | 181.18 | F = 181.18/19.24 = 9.42 |
| Within | 21,796 | 1133 | 19.24 | $F_{.99}$ (3, 1133) = 3.80 |
| Total | 22,340 | 1136 | | |

Table IV-31. Summary of comparisons in Tables IV-2 through 30.

| Table | Comparisons of CS sub-samples | Comparisons of SI with CS |
|---|---|---|
| 2 | Higher average education in schools sending more persons to institutes. | SI had higher average education than CS. |
| 3 | More courses in testing in schools sending more persons to institutes. | SI had fewer courses in testing than CS(1) or CS(> 1) |
| 4 | No relation. | SI more frequently felt information in files to be sufficient than did CS. |
| 5 | No relation. | SI more frequently discussed test results with parents. |
| 6 | No relation. | SI more frequently discussed test results with students. |
| 7 | No relation. | SI more frequently discussed test results with parents, students, and other teachers. |
| 8 | No relation. | No difference ($.05 < P < .10$). |
| 9 | No relation. | SI less frequently preferred test results to be made available to teachers in administrative office. |
| 10 | No relation. | SI more frequently preferred that an appointed person discuss test results with teachers. |
| 11 | CS(> 1) more frequently preferred descriptive test results be given teacher to keep. | SI more frequently than CS preferred descriptive test results be given teacher to keep. |
| 12 | CS(> 1) less frequently preferred group meetings for learning about test results. | SI more frequently than CS(1) or CS(> 1) preferred group meetings for learning about test results. |
| 13 | No relation. | No difference. |
| 14 | No relation. | No difference. |
| 15 | No relation. | No difference. |
| 16 | No relation. | No difference. |
| 17 | No relation. | No difference ($.05 < P < .10$). |

Table IV-31 continued.

| Table | Comparisons of CS sub-samples | Comparisons of SI with CS |
|---|---|---|
| 18 | No relation. | SI referred more students for vocational counseling. |
| 19 | No relation. | SI referred more students for educational counseling. |
| 20 | No relation. | SI referred more students for counseling about college goals. |
| 21 | More referrals for counseling concerning academic problems in schools sending more persons to institutes. | SI referred more students for counseling concerning academic problems. |
| 22 | More referrals for counseling concerning disciplinary problems in schools sending more persons to institutes. | SI not different from CS as a whole, but referred fewer students for disciplinary reasons than CS($>1$). Among teachers only, SI referred fewer than CS as a whole -- see Table II-52. |
| 23 | | No difference. |
| 24 | | No difference ($.05 < P < .10$). |
| 25 | | No difference. |
| 26 | | SI counselors reported more students referred for counseling concerning academic problems. |
| 27 | | SI counselors reported fewer students referred for counseling concerning disciplinary problems. |
| 28-30 | No relation | SI showed less agreement with experts on counselor's appropriate role. |

Table IV-32. Change from spring of 1959 (SSA) to fall of 1960 (CS) in relations between training classification of school and other variables. Interaction chi-square was obtained by the Lancaster method. "NS" means $P > .05$.

Key: A: sample: spring 1959 (SSA) or fall 1960 (CS).
B: training classification of school: whether school sent none, one, or more than one person to an institute during the period covered.
C: variable listed below.

| C-variable | BC |  |  | AC |  |  | AB |  |  | Interaction |  |  |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
|  | Chi-square | df | P | Chi-square | df | P | Chi-square | df | P | Chi-square | df | P |
| General education | 20.52 | 8 | <.01 | 34.46 | 4 | <.001 | 10.66 | 2 | <.01 | 3.92 | 8 | NS |
| No. courses in testing | 29.79 | 6 | <.001 | 44.06 | 3 | <.001 | 10.25 | 2 | <.01 | 0 | 6 | NS |
| Test attitude ABC | 8.26 | 4 | NS | 9.73 | 2 | <.01 | 11.51 | 2 | <.01 | 4.58 | 4 | NS |
| Test disc. with parents | 7.06 | 6 | NS | 49.79 | 3 | <.001 | 11.05 | 2 | <.01 | 6.67 | 6 | NS |
| Test disc. with students | 2.72 | 6 | NS | 43.09 | 3 | <.001 | 10.99 | 2 | <.01 | 1.21 | 6 | NS |
| Should interest tests be administered? | 2.35 | 2 | NS | 30.52 | 1 | <.001 | 13.78 | 2 | <.01 | 3.66 | 2 | NS |

# CHAPTER V

## COMPARISONS OF COUNSELORS, TEACHERS, AND PRINCIPALS

Throughout Projects 509 and 702, we kept looking for ways in which counselors could be distinguished from teachers and administrators. This chapter carries this search onward by comparing these three groups on most of the variables already met in this report. The comparisons are shown in Tables V-1 through 28 and are summarized in Table V-29.

The first thing which stands out in these tables is the fact that when the three groups differ, teachers stand out from counselors and administrators. This can easily be seen scanning the "comparison" section of Table V-29. When we note in Tables V-1 and 2 that counselors and administrators were more similar to each other in training than either group was to teachers, the fact that teachers stand out in the remaining tables in comparison to the other two groups is seen to be consistent with the findings in Chapter VI of the report of Project 702, where it was demonstrated that difference after difference among these three groups disappeared when level of training was taken into account.

Table V-29 shows that in 17 variables out of the 28 a difference among the three groups found in one sample was mirrored in the other two samples. One of the places where the samples were not the same was in the series of tables (V-6 through 11) concerning the question whether certain kinds of standardized tests ought to be administered in the school. In Table V-29, we see in Items 6 through 11 that the typical pattern in the SSA sample was for relatively more teachers than administrators or counselors to be in favor of administering each of these kinds of tests, while in the CS and SI samples the tendency was for relatively fewer teachers than counselors or administrators to be in favor of administering them. (However, in all three samples the majority of each group was in favor of administering all six types of tests. Detailed tabulations were given in Chapter II, Tables II-6 through 11, II-17 through 22, and II-28 through 33.) It seems difficult to explain why teachers should stand out from the other two groups in the SSA sample in a direction opposite the way they stood out in the CS and SI samples. Since larger proportions of school faculty members were in favor of administering all kinds of tests in 1960 than in 1959 (see Chapter II), it might have been that this increase of favorability (perhaps due to the publicity in the popular and professional press during that year concerning the search for talent) affected teachers and the other two groups differentially, causing counselors and administrators for some reason to increase their favorability at a faster rate than did teachers. Although the SSA sample differed from the other two in pattern of response to the six items concerning kinds of standardized tests which ought to be administered, the two 1960 samples were in substantial agreement.

The pattern of response in the SI sample to the test attitude ABC items (Table V-3), which differed markedly from the patter of response in the SSA and CS samples, may have been due (as we remarked earlier) to a negativistic feeling on the part of a few individuals in response to the heightened communication in their schools concerning guidance and testing and to the research we were carrying on there.

The other differences across samples mentioned in Table V-29 are minor. Ignoring the minor differences, the samples showed substantially the same patterns in 20 out of the 28 variables in Table V-29. On balance, the comparisons of teachers, counselors, and administrators in the three samples give a picture of impressively similar groups.

Table V-1. Distribution of general education among teachers, counselors, and administrators in the three samples. Entries in body of table are percentages. Underlined percentages are higher than expected from marginal totals. In the CS and SI samples, "administrators" include department heads and a few others, chiefly librarians.

**SSA**

| Group | Bachelor's or less | Less than master's | Master's | Adv. cert. or less | More than adv. cert. | Total | N |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Teachers | 24.5 | 27.5 | 28.8 | 13.0 | 6.2 | 100 | 2708 |
| Counselors | 2.2 | 6.1 | 33.2 | 35.4 | 23.1 | 100 | 229 |
| Administrators | 0.4 | 1.5 | 41.1 | 36.7 | 20.3 | 100 | 521 |
| | | | | | | | 3458 |

Chi-square = 642.03. P < .001

**CS**

| Group | Bachelor's or less | Less than master's | Master's | Adv. cert. or less | More than adv. cert. | Total | N |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Teachers | 13.5 | 32.7 | 32.8 | 15.9 | 5.1 | 100 | 842 |
| Counselors | 0 | 3.1 | 37.5 | 31.3 | 28.1 | 100 | 32 |
| Administrators | 0 | 3.7 | 48.1 | 37.0 | 11.2 | 100 | 54 |
| | | | | | | | 928 |

Chi-square = 84.45. P < .001

**SI** (spring)

| Group | Bachelor's or less | Less than master's | Master's | Adv. cert. or less | More than adv. cert. | Total | N |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Teachers | 19.6 | 26.7 | 21.7 | 22.5 | 9.5 | 100 | 423 |
| Counselors | 2.4 | 9.5 | 25.0 | 46.4 | 16.7 | 100 | 84 |
| Administrators | 10.7 | 6.3 | 25.0 | 43.8 | 14.2 | 100 | 112 |
| | | | | | | | 619 |

Chi-square = 66.28. P < .001

Table V-2. Distribution of number of courses in testing among teachers, counselors, and administrators in the three samples.

SSA

| Group | None | 1 | 2 | ≥ 3 | Total | N |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Teachers | 22.8 | 39.3 | 25.2 | 12.7 | 100 | 2684 |
| Counselors | 8.6 | 20.7 | 25.7 | 45.0 | 100 | 222 |
| Administrators | 4.4 | 15.7 | 30.0 | 49.9 | 100 | 517 |
| | | | | | | 3423 |

Chi-square = 540.44. P < .001

CS

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Teachers | 15.0 | 31.0 | 30.1 | 23.9 | 100 | 828 |
| Counselors | 0 | 6.3 | 28.1 | 65.6 | 100 | 32 |
| Administrators | 0 | 17.0 | 28.3 | 54.7 | 100 | 53 |
| | | | | | | 913 |

Chi-square = 58.01. P < .001

SI (spring)

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Teachers | 23.9 | 34.0 | 28.1 | 14.0 | 100 | 425 |
| Counselors | 3.7 | 13.4 | 37.8 | 45.1 | 100 | 82 |
| Administrators | 9.1 | 18.2 | 39.1 | 33.6 | 100 | 110 |
| | | | | | | 615 |

Chi-square = 82.94. P < .001

Table V-3. **Test attitude ABC among teachers, counselors, and administrators in the three samples.**

**SSA**

| | Attitude | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Group | A | B | C | Total | N |
| Teachers | 40.8 | 53.4 | 5.8 | 100 | 2612 |
| Counselors | 36.7 | 62.4 | 0.9 | 100 | 210 |
| Administrators | 48.8 | 50.4 | 0.8 | 100 | 508 |
| | | | | | 3330 |

Chi-square = 41.71

P < .001

**CS**

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Teachers | 32.6 | 61.0 | 6.4 | 100 | 831 |
| Counselors | 27.6 | 72.4 | 0 | 100 | 29 |
| Administrators | 47.2 | 52.8 | 0 | 100 | 53 |
| | | | | | 913 |

Chi-square = 9.49

P < .05

**SI** (1959)

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Teachers | 36.8 | 53.4 | 9.8 | 100 | 386 |
| Counselors | 20.2 | 71.4 | 8.4 | 100 | 84 |
| Administrators | 26.2 | 64.2 | 9.2 | 100 | 109 |
| | | | | | 579 |

Chi-square = 12.23

P < .025

Table V-4. Frequency of discussing test results with parents by teachers, counselors, and administrators in the three samples.

SSA

| Group | Never | Rarely | Some-times | Fre-quently | Total | N |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Teachers | 16.5 | 32.3 | 39.9 | 11.3 | 100 | 2643 |
| Counselors | 0 | 2.6 | 43.0 | 54.4 | 100 | 228 |
| Administrators | 1.0 | 9.8 | 48.3 | 40.9 | 100 | 518 |
| | | | | | | 3389 |

Chi-square = 621.33. P < .001

CS

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Teachers | 39.6 | 32.0 | 24.9 | 3.5 | 100 | 815 |
| Counselors | 3.1 | 3.1 | 46.9 | 46.9 | 100 | 32 |
| Administrators | 3.8 | 9.4 | 43.4 | 43.4 | 100 | 53 |
| | | | | | | 900 |

Chi-square = 260.25. P < .001

SI (spring)

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Teachers | 33.0 | 34.2 | 28.4 | 4.4 | 100 | 412 |
| Counselors | 0 | 3.5 | 37.6 | 58.9 | 100 | 85 |
| Administrators | 20.2 | 14.7 | 36.7 | 28.4 | 100 | 109 |
| | | | | | | 606 |

Chi-square = 204.83. P < .001

Table V-5. Frequency of discussing test results with students by teachers, counselors, and administrators in the three samples.

SSA

| Group | Never | Rarely | Some-times | Fre-quently | Total | N |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Teachers | 12.3 | 21.8 | 49.1 | 16.8 | 100 | 2664 |
| Counselors | 0 | 1.8 | 23.7 | 74.5 | 100 | 228 |
| Administrators | 1.2 | 3.8 | 36.9 | 58.1 | 100 | 520 |
| | | | | | | 3412 |

Chi-square = 709.30. P < .001

CS

| Group | Never | Rarely | Some-times | Fre-quently | Total | N |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Teachers | 29.7 | 26.2 | 35.9 | 8.2 | 100 | 821 |
| Counselors | 3.1 | 3.1 | 28.1 | 65.7 | 100 | 32 |
| Administrators | 3.7 | 5.6 | 25.9 | 64.8 | 100 | 54 |
| | | | | | | 907 |

Chi-square = 217.13. P < .001

SI (spring)

| Group | Never | Rarely | Some-times | Fre-quently | Total | N |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Teachers | 24.8 | 32.2 | 32.9 | 10.1 | 100 | 416 |
| Counselors | 0 | 0 | 30.6 | 69.4 | 100 | 85 |
| Administrators | 15.6 | 14.7 | 38.5 | 31.2 | 100 | 109 |
| | | | | | | 610 |

Chi-square = 175.09. P < .001

**Table V-6.** Answers of teachers, counselors, and administrators in the three samples to the question whether intelligence tests ought to be administered.

**SSA**

| Group | Yes | No | Total | N |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Teachers | 68.6 | 41.4 | 100 | 2418 |
| Counselors | 68.4 | 41.6 | 100 | 206 |
| Administrators | 61.6 | 48.4 | 100 | 467 |
| | | | | 3088 |

Chi-square = 9.08

P < .025

**CS**

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Teachers | 85.1 | 14.9 | 100 | 839 |
| Counselors | 87.5 | 12.5 | 100 | 32 |
| Administrators | 96.3 | 3.7 | 100 | 54 |
| | | | | 925 |

Chi-square = 4.69

NS

**SI** (spring)

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Teachers | 89.1 | 10.9 | 100 | 423 |
| Counselors | 92.9 | 7.1 | 100 | 85 |
| Administrators | 90.1 | 9.9 | 100 | 111 |
| | | | | 619 |

Chi-square = 1.35

NS

Table V-7. **Answers of teachers, counselors, and administrators in the three samples to the question whether tests of academic aptitude ought to be administered.**

**SSA**

| Group | Yes | No | Total | N | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Teachers | 72.7 | 27.3 | 100 | 2418 | Chi-square = 9.69 |
| Counselors | 67.5 | 32.5 | 100 | 206 | P < .01 |
| Administrators | 66.4 | 33.6 | 100 | 464 | |
| | | | | 3088 | |

**CS**

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Teachers | 84.4 | 15.6 | 100 | 839 | Chi-square = 4.24 |
| Counselors | 87.5 | 12.5 | 100 | 32 | NS |
| Administrators | 94.4 | 5.6 | 100 | 54 | |
| | | | | 925 | |

**SI (spring)**

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Teachers | 84.6 | 15.4 | 100 | 423 | Chi-square = 7.90 |
| Counselors | 95.3 | 4.7 | 100 | 85 | P < .025 |
| Administrators | 89.2 | 10.8 | 100 | 111 | |
| | | | | 619 | |

**Table V-8.** Answers of teachers, counselors, and administrators in the three samples to the question whether tests of achievement in subject fields ought to be administered.

SSA

| Group | Yes | No | Total | N |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Teachers | 69.6 | 30.4 | 100 | 2418 |
| Counselors | 71.8 | 28.2 | 100 | 206 |
| Administrators | 66.6 | 33.4 | 100 | 464 |
| | | | | 3088 |

Chi-square = 2.12

NS

CS

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Teachers | 74.9 | 25.1 | 100 | 839 |
| Counselors | 87.5 | 12.5 | 100 | 32 |
| Administrators | 88.9 | 11.1 | 100 | 54 |
| | | | | 925 |

Chi-square = 7.45

P < .025

SI (spring)

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Teachers | 74.5 | 25.5 | 100 | 423 |
| Counselors | 92.9 | 7.1 | 100 | 85 |
| Administrators | 91.0 | 9.0 | 100 | 111 |
| | | | | 619 |

Chi-square = 24.85

P < .001

Table V-9. Answers of teachers, counselors, and administrators in the three samples to the question whether tests of achievement in reading ought to be administered.

SSA

| Group | Yes | No | Total | N |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Teachers | 74.1 | 25.9 | 100 | 2418 |
| Counselors | 72.3 | 27.7 | 100 | 206 |
| Administrators | 69.0 | 31.0 | 100 | 464 |
| | | | | 3088 |

Chi-square = 4.98
.05 < P < .10

CS

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Teachers | 79.7 | 20.3 | 100 | 839 |
| Counselors | 84.4 | 15.6 | 100 | 32 |
| Administrators | 81.5 | 18.5 | 100 | 54 |
| | | | | 925 |

Chi-square = 0.35
NS

SI (spring)

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Teachers | 86.8 | 13.2 | 100 | 423 |
| Counselors | 95.3 | 4.7 | 100 | 85 |
| Administrators | 91.9 | 8.1 | 100 | 111 |
| | | | | 619 |

Chi-square = 5.89
.05 < P < .10

**Table V-10.** Answers of teachers, counselors, and administrators in the three samples to the question whether interest tests ought to be administered.

**SSA**

| Group | Yes | No | Total | N |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Teachers | 77.2 | 22.8 | 100 | 2418 |
| Counselors | 71.8 | 28.2 | 100 | 206 |
| Administrators | 72.2 | 27.8 | 100 | 464 |
| | | | | 3088 |

Chi-square = 7.66

P < .025

**CS**

| Group | Yes | No | Total | N |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Teachers | 67.6 | 32.4 | 100 | 829 |
| Counselors | 81.3 | 18.7 | 100 | 32 |
| Administrators | 87.0 | 13.0 | 100 | 54 |
| | | | | 925 |

Chi-square = 12.01

P < .001

**SI** (spring)

| Group | Yes | No | Total | N |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Teachers | 74.5 | 25.5 | 100 | 423 |
| Counselors | 82.4 | 17.6 | 100 | 85 |
| Administrators | 84.7 | 15.3 | 100 | 111 |
| | | | | 619 |

Chi-square = 6.33

P < .05

Table V-11. Answers of teachers, counselors, and administrators in the three samples to the question whether personality tests ought to be administered.

**SSA**

| Group | Yes | No | Total | N |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Teachers | 70.7 | 29.3 | 100 | 2418 |
| Counselors | 73.8 | 26.2 | 100 | 206 |
| Administrators | 70.9 | 29.1 | 100 | 464 |
| | | | | 3088 |

Chi-square = 0.92

NS

**CS**

| Group | Yes | No | Total | N |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Teachers | 55.3 | 44.7 | 100 | 839 |
| Counselors | 67.7 | 32.3 | 100 | 31 |
| Administrators | 75.5 | 24.5 | 100 | 53 |
| | | | | 923 |

Chi-square = 9.69

P < .01

**SI** (spring)

| Group | Yes | No | Total | N |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Teachers | 54.1 | 45.9 | 100 | 423 |
| Counselors | 57.6 | 42.4 | 100 | 85 |
| Administrators | 60.4 | 39.6 | 100 | 111 |
| | | | | 619 |

Chi-square = 1.57

NS

Table V-12. Satisfaction with kinds of tests administered in the school among teachers, counselors, and administrators in the SI and CS samples.

SI (spring)

| Group | 3 or more kinds desired than given | 2 more kinds desired than given | One more kind desired than given | Same kinds desired as given | More kinds given than desired | Total | N |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Teachers | 12.0 | 16.7 | 20.4 | 25.9 | 25.0 | 100 | 401 |
| Counselors | 5.9 | 8.2 | 24.7 | 45.9 | 15.3 | 100 | 85 |
| Administrators | 3.6 | 15.3 | 28.8 | 36.9 | 15.4 | 100 | 111 |
| | | | | | | | 597 |

Chi-square = 31.68. P < .001

CS

| Group | 3 or more kinds desired than given | 2 more kinds desired than given | One more kind desired than given | Same kinds desired as given | More kinds given than desired | Total | N |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Teachers | 14.1 | 14.6 | 19.1 | 26.7 | 25.5 | 100 | 803 |
| Counselors | 3.1 | 12.5 | 12.5 | 53.1 | 18.8 | 100 | 32 |
| Administrators | 9.4 | 20.8 | 18.9 | 37.7 | 13.2 | 100 | 53 |
| | | | | | | | 888 |

Chi-square = 18.22. P < .02

Table V-13. Answers of teachers, counselors, and administrators in the SI and CS samples to the question whether the information which the school obtains and files about students is sufficient.

SI (spring)

| Group | Yes | No | Uncertain | Total | N |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Teachers | 21.9 | 59.7 | 18.4 | 100 | 424 |
| Counselors | 10.7 | 85.7 | 3.6 | 100 | 84 |
| Administrators | 17.1 | 66.7 | 16.2 | 100 | 111 |
| | | | | | 619 |

| | Yes | No | Total | N |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Teachers | 73.1 | 26.9 | 100 | 346 |
| Counselors | 88.9 | 11.1 | 100 | 81 |
| Administrators | 79.6 | 20.4 | 100 | 93 |
| | | | | 520 |

Chi-square = 9.73
P < .01

| | Yes or no | Un-certain | Total | N |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Teachers | 81.6 | 18.4 | 100 | 424 |
| Counselors | 96.4 | 3.6 | 100 | 84 |
| Administrators | 83.8 | 16.2 | 100 | 111 |
| | | | | 619 |

Chi-square = 10.85
P < .005

CS

| Group | Yes | No | Uncertain | Total | N |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Teachers | 21.3 | 59.4 | 19.3 | 100 | 832 |
| Counselors | 25.8 | 71.0 | 3.2 | 100 | 31 |
| Administrators | 26.4 | 64.2 | 9.4 | 100 | 53 |
| | | | | | 916 |

| | Yes | No | Total | N |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Teachers | 73.6 | 26.4 | 100 | 671 |
| Counselors | 73.3 | 26.7 | 100 | 30 |
| Administrators | 70.8 | 29.2 | 100 | 48 |
| | | | | 749 |

Chi-square = 0.11
NS

| | Yes or no | Un-certain | Total | N |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Teachers | 80.6 | 19.4 | 100 | 832 |
| Counselors | 96.8 | 3.2 | 100 | 31 |
| Administrators | 90.6 | 9.4 | 100 | 53 |
| | | | | 916 |

Chi-square = 8.90
P < .025

Table V-14. Answers among teachers, counselors, and administrators in the SI and CS samples concerning test dissemination to teachers: should test scores be kept in an administrative office where any may look them up who wish?

SI (spring)

| Group | Yes | No | Total | N |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Teachers | 58.4 | 41.6 | 100 | 413 |
| Counselors | 45.1 | 54.9 | 100 | 82 |
| Administrators | 58.3 | 41.7 | 100 | 108 |
| | | | | 603 |

Chi-square = 4.64

.05 < P < .10

CS

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Teachers | 60.6 | 39.4 | 100 | 840 |
| Counselors | 71.9 | 28.1 | 100 | 32 |
| Administrators | 79.6 | 20.4 | 100 | 54 |
| | | | | 926 |

Chi-square = 9.85

P < .01

Table V-15. Answers among teachers, counselors, and administrators in the SI and CS samples concerning test dissemination to teachers: should test scores be kept in a particular office where an appointed person will discuss the results with any teacher who asks?

SI (spring)

| Group | Yes | No | Total | N |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Teachers | 57.6 | 42.4 | 100 | 413 |
| Counselors | 73.2 | 26.8 | 100 | 82 |
| Administrators | 66.7 | 33.3 | 100 | 108 |
| | | | | 603 |

Chi-square = 8.40

P < .02

CS

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Teachers | 50.1 | 49.9 | 100 | 840 |
| Counselors | 71.9 | 28.1 | 100 | 32 |
| Administrators | 55.6 | 44.4 | 100 | 54 |
| | | | | 926 |

Chi-square = 6.81

P < .05

Table V-16. Answers among teachers, counselors, and administrators in the SI and CS samples concerning test dissemination to teachers: should test results in descriptive form (not actual scores) be given to the teacher to keep?

SI (spring)

| Group | Yes | No | Total | N |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Teachers | 30.5 | 69.5 | 100 | 413 |
| Counselors | 37.8 | 62.2 | 100 | 82 |
| Administrators | 32.4 | 67.6 | 100 | 108 |
| | | | | 603 |

Chi-square = 1.85

NS

CS

| Group | Yes | No | Total | N |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Teachers | 24.6 | 75.4 | 100 | 840 |
| Counselors | 28.1 | 71.9 | 100 | 32 |
| Administrators | 37.0 | 63.0 | 100 | 54 |
| | | | | 926 |

Chi-square = 3.95

NS

Table V-17. Answers among teachers, counselors, and administrators in the SI and CS samples concerning test dissemination to teachers: should group meetings be held at which test results are explained and discussed with teachers?

SI (spring)

| Group | Yes | No | Total | N |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Teachers | 51.8 | 48.2 | 100 | 413 |
| Counselors | 78.0 | 22.0 | 100 | 82 |
| Administrators | 64.8 | 35.2 | 100 | 108 |
| | | | | 603 |

Chi-square = 21.98

$P < .001$

CS

| Group | Yes | No | Total | N |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Teachers | 51.0 | 49.0 | 100 | 840 |
| Counselors | 68.8 | 31.2 | 100 | 32 |
| Administrators | 72.2 | 27.8 | 100 | 54 |
| | | | | 926 |

Chi-square = 13.34

$P < .005$

Table V-18. Answers among teachers, counselors, and administrators in the SI and CS samples concerning test dissemination to parents: should it be the practice that any parent who wishes may confer with the principal or guidance counselor and receive information about test results -- that teachers should not give such information?

SI (spring)

| Group | Yes | No | Total | N |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Teachers | 73.3 | 26.7 | 100 | 423 |
| Counselors | 86.0 | 14.0 | 100 | 86 |
| Administrators | 79.5 | 20.5 | 100 | 112 |
| | | | | 621 |

Chi-square = 7.43

P < .025

CS

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Teachers | 73.6 | 26.4 | 100 | 772 |
| Counselors | 87.5 | 12.5 | 100 | 32 |
| Administrators | 80.4 | 19.6 | 100 | 51 |
| | | | | 855 |

Chi-square = 3.93

NS

Table V-19. Answers among teachers, counselors, and administrators in the SI and CS samples concerning test dissemination to parents: should it be the practice that any parent who wishes may confer with any teacher and receive information about test results?

SI (spring)

| Group | Yes | No | Total | N |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Teachers | 14.9 | 85.1 | 100 | 423 |
| Counselors | 9.3 | 90.7 | 100 | 86 |
| Administrators | 10.7 | 89.3 | 100 | 112 |
| | | | | 621 |

Chi-square = 2.36

NS

CS

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Teachers | 15.9 | 84.1 | 100 | 772 |
| Counselors | 12.5 | 87.5 | 100 | 32 |
| Administrators | 19.6 | 80.4 | 100 | 51 |
| | | | | 855 |

Chi-square = 0.84

NS

Table V-20. Answers among teachers, counselors, and administrators in the SI and CS samples concerning test dissemination to parents: should it be the practice that parents whose children present academic or disciplinary problems are called in for conference and test results are used as part of the conference?

SI (spring)

| Group | Yes | No | Total | N |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Teachers | 59.6 | 40.4 | 100 | 425 |
| Counselors | 64.0 | 36.0 | 100 | 86 |
| Administrators | 71.4 | 28.6 | 100 | 112 |
| | | | | 621 |

Chi-square = 5.08

.05 < P < .10

CS

| Group | Yes | No | Total | N |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Teachers | 61.3 | 38.7 | 100 | 772 |
| Counselors | 81.3 | 18.7 | 100 | 32 |
| Administrators | 76.5 | 23.5 | 100 | 51 |
| | | | | 855 |

Chi-square = 9.85

P < .01

Table V-21. Answers among teachers, counselors, and administrators in the SI and CS samples concerning test dissemination to students: should it be the practice that teachers discuss test results with students when the occasion arises or the need occurs -- this being largely at the discretion of the teacher?

SI (spring)

| Group | Yes | No | Total | N |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Teachers | 43.1 | 56.9 | 100 | 420 |
| Counselors | 32.9 | 67.1 | 100 | 85 |
| Administrators | 36.0 | 64.0 | 100 | 111 |
| | | | | 616 |

Chi-square = 3.89

NS

CS

| Group | Yes | No | Total | N |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Teachers | 39.8 | 60.2 | 100 | 772 |
| Counselors | 34.4 | 65.6 | 100 | 32 |
| Administrators | 42.6 | 57.4 | 100 | 54 |
| | | | | 858 |

Chi-square = 0.83

NS

Table V-22. Answers among teachers, counselors, and administrators in the SI and CS samples concerning test dissemination to students: should it be the practice that counselors confer at certain times with students individually and discuss their test results in the context of the students' future plans?

SI (spring)

| Group | Yes | No | Total | N |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Teachers | 89.0 | 11.0 | 100 | 420 |
| Counselors | 97.6 | 2.4 | 100 | 85 |
| Administrators | 91.9 | 8.1 | 100 | 111 |
| | | | | 616 |

Chi-square = 6.46

P < .05

CS

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Teachers | 85.9 | 14.1 | 100 | 772 |
| Counselors | 93.8 | 6.2 | 100 | 32 |
| Administrators | 92.6 | 7.4 | 100 | 54 |
| | | | | 858 |

Chi-square = 2.90

NS

Table V-23. Distribution of TDS scores among teachers, counselors, and administrators in the SI and CS samples.

SI (spring)

| | TDS score | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Group | 0-2 | 3-4 | 5-6 | 7-9 | Total | N |
| Teachers | 29.6 | 31.1 | 30.4 | 8.9 | 100 | 425 |
| Counselors | 0 | 0 | 17.4 | 82.6 | 100 | 86 |
| Administrators | 20.5 | 9.8 | 33.9 | 35.8 | 100 | 112 |
| | | | | | | 623 |

Chi-square = 249.70. P < .001

CS

| | TDS score | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 0-1 | 2-4 | 5-7 | 8-9 | | |
| Teachers | 17.4 | 44.8 | 33.9 | 3.9 | 100 | 832 |
| Counselors | 3.1 | 3.1 | 43.8 | 50.0 | 100 | 32 |
| Administrators | 0 | 9.3 | 40.7 | 50.0 | 100 | 54 |
| | | | | | | 918 |

Chi-square = 249.20. P < .001

Table V-24. Number of students referred to counselor by teachers and administrators in the SI and CS samples for vocational counseling.

SI (1960)

| Group | None | 1-9 | 10-up | Total | N |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Teachers | 70.9 | 20.7 | 8.4 | 100 | 309 |
| Administrators | 57.5 | 11.0 | 31.5 | 100 | 73 |
| | | | | | 382 |

Chi-square = 31.45
P < .001

CS

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Teachers | 79.5 | 14.2 | 6.3 | 100 | 781 |
| Administrators | 59.2 | 10.2 | 30.6 | 100 | 49 |
| | | | | | 830 |

Chi-square = 35.14
P < .001

Table V-25. Number of students referred to counselor by teachers and administrators in the SI and CS samples for educational counseling.

SI (1960)

| Group | None | 1-9 | 10-up | Total | N |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Teachers | 64.2 | 21.1 | 14.7 | 100 | 279 |
| Administrators | 44.3 | 12.9 | 42.8 | 100 | 70 |
| | | | | | 349 |

Chi-square = 28.63
P < .001

CS

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Teachers | 74.1 | 15.4 | 10.5 | 100 | 765 |
| Administrators | 58.7 | 8.7 | 32.6 | 100 | 46 |
| | | | | | 811 |

Chi-square = 24.00
P < .001

Table V-26. Number of students referred to counselor by teachers and administrators in the SI and CS samples for counseling concerning college goals.

SI (1960)

| Group | None | 1-9 | 10-up | Total | N |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Teachers | 69.2 | 19.9 | 10.9 | 100 | 292 |
| Administrators | 43.5 | 13.0 | 43.5 | 100 | 69 |
| | | | | | 361 |

Chi-square = 40.50

P < .001

CS

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Teachers | 74.6 | 17.5 | 7.9 | 100 | 771 |
| Administrators | 58.0 | 6.0 | 36.0 | 100 | 50 |
| | | | | | 821 |

Chi-square = 41.24

P < .001

Table V-27. Number of students referred to counselor by teachers and administrators in the SI and CS samples for counseling concerning academic problems.

SI (1960)

| Group | None | 1-9 | 10-up | Total | N |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Teachers | 74.2 | 18.8 | 7.0 | 100 | 298 |
| Administrators | 42.5 | 16.4 | 41.1 | 100 | 73 |
| | | | | | 371 |

Chi-square = 70.64

P < .001

CS

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Teachers | 79.8 | 14.4 | 5.8 | 100 | 779 |
| Administrators | 63.3 | 6.1 | 30.6 | 100 | 49 |
| | | | | | 828 |

Chi-square = 54.70

P < .001

Table V-28. **Number of students referred to counselor by teachers and administrators in the SI and CS samples for counseling concerning disciplinary problems.**

SI (1960)

| Group | None | 1-9 | 10-up | Total | N |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Teachers | 77.1 | 20.6 | 2.3 | 100 | 301 |
| Administrators | 54.7 | 17.3 | 28.0 | 100 | 75 |
| | | | | | 376 |

**Chi-square = 51.96**
**P < .001**

CS

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Teachers | 75.6 | 18.0 | 6.4 | 100 | 766 |
| Administrators | 63.3 | 10.2 | 26.5 | 100 | 49 |
| | | | | | 815 |

**Chi-square = 23.87**
**P < .001**

Table V-29. Summary of comparisons in Tables V-1 through 28.

| Table | Variable | Comparison |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | General education. | Same relation in all three samples; teachers had less education than counselors or administrators. |
| 2 | No. of courses in testing. | Same. Teachers had fewer courses. |
| 3 | Test attitude ABC. | Preference for choice "C" was relatively heavier in SI, particularly among counselors and administrators, than in SSA or CS. In SI relatively more teachers also preferred choice "A" while in SSA and CS a greater proportion of administrators had this preference. |
| 4 | Test discussion with parents. | Same. Teachers discussed tests less frequently. |
| 5 | Test discussion with students. | Same. Teachers discussed tests less frequently. |
| 6 | Should intelligence tests...? | In SSA relatively more administrators than teachers or counselors said no; NS in CS and SI. |
| 7 | Should acad. apt. tests...? | In SSA relatively more teachers said yes but in SI relatively more teachers said no; NS in CS. |
| 8 | Achieve. in subj. fields...? | In CS and SI relatively more teachers said no; NS in SSA. |
| 9 | Should achieve. in reading...? | In SSA relatively more teachers said yes but in SI relatively more teachers said no; NS in CS. |
| 10 | Should interest tests...? | In SSA relatively more teachers said yes but in CS and SI relatively more teachers said no. |
| 11 | Should personality tests...? | In CS relatively more teachers said no; NS in SSA and SI. |
| 12 | Satisfaction with number of kinds of tests. | Same. Teachers were relatively less satisfied in both SI and CS samples. |

Table V-29 continued.

| Table | Variable | Comparison |
|---|---|---|
| 13 | Is information in the school files sufficient? | Relatively more teachers uncertain both in CS and SI. Of those saying yes or no in SI, relatively more teachers said no. |
| | Test dissemination to teachers: | |
| 14 | Available in administrative office to all? | In SI relatively more counselors said no; in CS relatively more teachers said no. |
| 15 | Under care of an appointed person? | Same. Relatively more teachers said no in both samples. |
| 16 | Descriptions for teacher to keep? | Same; NS. |
| 17 | Group meetings? | Same. Relatively more teachers said no. |
| | Test dissemination to parents: | |
| 18 | Parent who wishes may confer with principal or guidance counselor only? | In SI relatively more teachers said no; same trend though NS in CS. |
| 19 | Confer with any teacher? | Same; NS. |
| 20 | Called in for child's problems? | Same. Relatively more teachers said no. |
| | Test dissemination to students: | |
| 21 | At discretion of teacher? | Same; NS. |
| 22 | Counselors confer with individuals? | In SI relatively more teachers said no; same trend though NS in CS. |
| 23 | Test Discussion Score (TDS) | Same. Teachers discussed tests less frequently with parents, students, and other teachers. |
| | Students referred to counselor: | |
| 24 | For vocational counseling. | Same. Teachers referred fewer than administrators. |
| 25 | For educational counseling. | Same. Teachers referred fewer. |
| 26 | For college goals. | Same. Teachers referred fewer. |
| 27 | Academic problems. | Same. Teachers referred fewer. |
| 28 | Disciplinary problems. | Same. Teachers referred fewer. |

# CHAPTER VI

## SUMMARY

This report extends two previous studies dealing with the use of test information and with related attitudes and practices. All three studies were conducted among wide-ranging samples of Illinois secondary school faculties. In addition to an analysis of the stability of selected test practices and attitudes, data are presented on the relative effectiveness of the training received in summer guidance institutes for teachers and counselors; effectiveness, that is, in respect to changing existing attitudes and practices among the faculty to which the trainee returns.

Three different samples of subjects were examined in this final phase of the study. The first consisted of all principals, all guidance directors, and from 5 to 15 randomly selected teachers in all high schools in Illinois having a total student body greater than 100. Because this sample was employed in the first of four substudies in an earlier phase (Project 509), we have labeled it the "Sub-study A" or "SSA" sample. The SSA data were collected in the spring of 1959. The second sample consisted of the faculties of 28 secondary schools which sent trainees to a guidance institute sponsored by the NDEA and held at the University of Illinois in the summer of 1959. This second sample was referred to as the "Summer Institute" or "SI" sample and included all administrators, all guidance counselors, and all teachers in most of the 28 schools; in those schools with faculties larger than 25, only about half the teachers were used. Data were collected between the summer of 1959 and the fall of 1960. Detailed analyses of the SI sample were conducted under Project 702. The third sample (obtained under the present project) was designed to provide control data against which to check the findings of the two earlier projects and was designated as the "Control School" or "CS" sample. It consisted of all administrators, counselors, and teachers in 50 randomly selected high schools in the state. As with the SI sample, however, only two-thirds to one-half the teachers were used in schools where the total faculty was extremely large. The CS data were collected in the fall of 1960.

In the SSA and CS samples data were collected by means of mailed questionnaires. In the SI sample only part of the data were collected by this means; the majority were obtained through interviews and small group meetings in which more complex instruments were employed. The percentage of return for teachers, counselors, and administrators in the three samples was about 80 to 90. The present report analyzes responses to those questionnaire items which were common to all three, or to any two, of the samples.

Our first concern (Chapter II) was with the stability of various test practices and attitudes over time among teachers, counselors, and administrators. Since the SSA and CS samples proved to be well representative of the total population of Illinois high school faculties and since the two sets of data were collected over one year apart (spring 1959 and fall 1960 respectively), changes in responses to questionnaire items could reasonably be interpreted as indicating changes in attitudes and perceptions in the state as a whole.

We found that the attitudes of counselors and school administrators were very stable but that those of teachers were not. In contrast to the SSA sample, teachers in the CS sample were more critical of the usefulness of tests, reported less frequent discussion of test results with students and parents, and showed increasing acceptance of intelligence and achievement tests along with decreasing acceptance of interest and personality tests. We also found that the CS teachers possessed a slightly (but significantly) higher level of education than did the SSA teachers.

The finding that a higher level of training in the CS sample, compared to the SSA sample, was accompanied by a more critical attitude toward tests replicated our findings in earlier studies. The remaining changes in receptivity towards various types of tests and the decreased tendency of teachers to discuss test results were unexpected. We inferred that they resulted from the wide-spread publicity in the public press and in educational circles regarding the "search for talent" and the importance of academic tests in this search, which may have encouraged teachers to feel that accurate interpretation of the results of such tests could best be done not by them but by professionally trained persons. With the exception of the increased rejection of personality and interest tests by teachers, however, the total group (i.e., counselors, administrators, and teachers) showed an increased tendency toward accepting tests of all types for use (if judiciously) in the school.

A comparison of the SI sample with the other two on these same variables showed it to be quite similar to the CS sample and almost equally dissimilar to the SSA sample, indicating that despite its lack of randomness it (the SI sample) was well representative of Illinois high schools generally.

Before continuing our analysis of differences between the SI, CS, and SSA samples, we made a further check in Chapter III on the general representativeness of the SI population by analyzing the relations among selected variables in all three samples and testing the relations for inter-sample differences. With one exception, namely the relation between educational level and criticalness of attitude towards tests, no differences in trends were found. This fact increased our faith in both the reliability of our data and the representativeness of our essentially non-random SI sample.

To study the effects of institute training upon test practices and attitudes we compared (in Chapter IV) the responses of individuals from three sub-groups of schools in the CS sample. These three sub-groups were comprised of (1) CS schools which sent two or more persons to guidance institutes, (2) those which sent one person to an institute, and (3) those which sent no one to such an institute.

Comparisons of the three CS sub-groups with each other showed that although the schools which had sent two or more persons to institutes comprised faculties with the highest mean level of training, no striking differences existed among them on the other variables we analyzed. A further check of the effectiveness of institute training received by members of the CS schools in changing test attitudes and practices was made by analyzing the relations among variables within SSA and CS sub-groups of schools, divided as before according to number of persons sent to guidance institutes. No significant differences in the shapes of the relations occurred, indicating that institute training did not bring about distributions of faculty responses differing from the responses of faculties in comparable schools before the institute training was received.

We next compared the SI sample with the three CS sub-groups. In this comparison, in contrast to the comparisons of the CS sub-groups with each other, we found a relatively large number of significant differences. Specifically, in comparison to the CS subsamples, members of the SI schools (1) had a higher mean level of training, (2) were more satisfied with the information about students in the school's files, (3) more frequently discussed test results with students, parents, and other teachers, (4) more frequently preferred methods of disseminating test results to teachers which would make the test results more readily useful, and (5) more frequently referred students to counselors for reasons which were presumably advocated by the instructors of the Illinois summer institute. Since the members of the SI sample were found to be similar to the members of the CS sample in other ways, since the differences found between the two samples were in some instances strikingly in line with the views of the instructors of the Illinois institute, and since the only criterion for selecting the SI schools was their participation in the Illinois institute, the differences between the two samples can reasonably be attributed to the intensive training received by the Illinois institute trainees and carried back by them to their schools. This unforeseen outcome was discussed in Chapter IV in the light of the results of Project 702.

We concluded the data analysis with a relatively extensive (and again futile) search for differences in perceptions and attitudes among teachers, counselors, and administrators (Chapter V). One of our hypotheses in previous studies was that the distinctive role taken by each of these three groups, quite aside from the levels of training received by the groups, would serve to produce significant differences in patterns of response to certain of the variables we studied. This hypothesis found no support in either of the past studies nor in the present study. On the whole counselors, teachers, and administrators in all three samples responded in impressively similar ways, and the few exceptions which did occur were readily explainable on grounds other than role.

In combination with the findings of Projects 509 and 702, the results of the present project lead to three major conclusions (or hypotheses for further testing) regarding the causes of changes in attitudes and practices among professionally trained school people. First, formal training of the type received in college and at the graduate level can be a powerful factor in effecting change. Second, social forces and trends in the culture are also powerful, but have the least effect upon persons with maximum amounts of formal training. Third, deliberate attempts to influence school practices (such as summer institutes) are most successful when they are accompanied by procedures and techniques designed to keep the basic purposes of the training effort in the forefront of the recipients' minds.

The research activities we carried on over a period of a year in the SI schools, including the "feedback" we gave them, must surely have heightened sensitivity to matters of guidance and testing. It must have aided cognitive clarity (Project 702 offers some direct evidence that clarity about the counselor's role was increased) and fostered thoughtfulness about the goals of counseling and testing. Perhaps our research also acted catalytically in regard to the search-for-talent propaganda which was flourishing at the time. Although Project 702 presented some clear evidence that the Illinois summer institute had in itself desirable effects on the trainees, we feel confident that our own research activities stimulated continued alertness in the SI schools to problems of guidance and contributed in an important amount to the remarkable effectiveness of the Illinois institute in influencing faculties, effectiveness for which we have given evidence in comparisons with sub-groups of the CS sample selected for having sent members to other institutes.

In our report on Project 702, we concluded that the Illinois institute trainees would have been more influential if they could have had the social support of another colleague or two trained in the same institute, a recommendation which receives ample backing from the social-psychological literature. In concluding the present study, the inference is clear that training one or a few members of a faculty will have enhanced effects on other segments of the faculty if follow-up measures are taken to focus continued faculty attention on the functions and purposes of the trainees' duties -- a conclusion which is also written large in the literature. No matter how good the seed which is sown, a plant cannot flourish in a new area if the environment does not provide room for it. So also, no matter how good the training which is given, continued cultivation of the social environment is necessary if the ideas sown by a trained person are to take root in the larger group.

## Student Information Study

# QUESTIONNAIRE FOR FACULTY MEMBERS

Your principal is permitting you
to receive this questionnaire through
the school office. Please read the
introductory paragraphs NOW.

Please do not write in this margin

This questionnaire is an important part of a statewide study of current school practices as viewed by principals, guidance counselors, teachers, and students. We are conducting this study under a research contract with the United States Office of Education.

Not all schools in the state are receiving these questionnaires. Your school is one of a representative group selected by a rigorous sampling procedure. It is of great importance that we receive this questionnaire from you promptly. We hope you can mail it to us within the next two days.

Almost everyone completes this booklet in an hour. Please return it to us as soon as you have filled it out, using the self-addressed and stamped envelope attached. We are employing this somewhat expensive procedure to insure that your responses will be kept completely confidential.

Name: ______________________________ Sex: M___ F___

School: ______________________________ Date: __________

1. How long have you been in the profession? ________years

2. How long have you been at this school? ________years

3. What is the highest degree you hold? — 9

None ____0
Bachelor's degree ____3
Master's degree ____4
Advanced Certificate in Education ____5
Doctor's degree ____6

4. How much additional college work have you taken since obtaining this degree? — 10

No. of semester hours ____
No. of quarter hours ____
No. of Univ. of Ill units ____

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS
Bureau of Educational Research
Champaign, Illinois
utr-cs

## Section I

### GENERAL INFORMATION

Please do not write in this margin

1. How much formal training have you had in the technicalities of testing and measurement? Please count in rough equivalents for workshops, institutes, in-service training, etc.

None ____ 0
One course ____ 1
Two courses ____ 2
Three courses ____ 3
More than three ____ 4

11

2. Below is a list of six different kinds of published tests. On the line to the right of each one, place an X if you think your school ought to administer it to students.

Intelligence ____
Academic aptitude ____
Achievement in subject fields ____
Achievement in reading ____
Interests ____
Personality ____

12 ☐
13 ☐
14 ☐
15 ☐
16 ☐
17 ☐

18 ☐

3. Which of the following types of tests are presently administered to students in your school?

Intelligence ____
Academic aptitude ____
Achievement in subject fields ____
Achievement in reading ____
Interests ____
Personality ____

4. Practically all schools keep some kind of cumulative records on their students which are available to teachers. Do you feel that the information which your school obtains and files about students is sufficient?

Yes ____ 1 No ____ 0 Uncertain ____ 2

(Use this space if you care to comment.)____________________

____________________

____________________

25 ☐
26 ☐
27

Please do not write in this margin

5. How do teachers in your school find out students' standardized test scores once their scores are reported to the school? Please check the space marked "1" after every method which is used in your school. (Do not use the spaces marked "2" as yet.)

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Scores are kept in an administration office and any teacher may look them up who wishes. | ___ 1 | ___ 2 | 29 ☐ |
| Scores are kept in a particular office and an appointed person will discuss the results with any teacher who asks. | ___ 1 | ___ 2 | 30 ☐ |
| Reports of results in some form are given to the teacher to give to the students, and the teacher can look them over before handing them out. | ___ 1 | ___ 2 | 31 ☐ |
| Copies of actual scores are given to the teacher for the teacher to keep. | ___ 1 | ___ 2 | 32 ☐ |
| Copies of test results in descriptive form (not actual scores) are given to the teacher for the teacher to keep. | ___ 1 | ___ 2 | 33 ☐ |
| Group meetings are held at which test results are explained and discussed with the teachers. | ___ 1 | ___ 2 | 34 ☐ |
| Conferences are scheduled with individual teachers to discuss test results. | ___ 1 | ___ 2 | 35 ☐ |

6. Which of the methods of transmitting test results listed just above are a good idea? Please go back over the list and mark in the space labeled "2" those methods which you think should be used in your school. Mark those which, if now used, you believe should be continued, and also those which, if not now used, you believe should be put into effect.

7. Does your school provide parents with information about their children's performance on standardized tests? (Exact scores need not be mentioned.

Yes ___ 1 No ___ 0 Uncertain ___ 2 36

Please do
not write
in this
margin

If your answer to question 7 is yes, which of the following best describes the procedure used? Please check the space marked "1" after every method which is used in your school. (Do not use the spaces marked "2" as yet.)

Any parent who wishes may confer with the principal or guidance counselor and receive such information. Teachers do not give such information. ____ 1 ____ 2 — 37 ☐

Any parent who wishes can confer with any teacher and receive such information ____ 1 ____ 2 — 38 ☐

Parents whose children present academic or disciplinary problems are called in for conference and test results are used as part of the conference. ____ 1 ____ 2 — 39 ☐

All parents are invited at certain times to come in and discuss their children's progress, and test scores are used as part of these conferences. ____ 1 ____ 2 — 40 ☐

Test results (some or all) are sent to parents in written form. ____ 1 ____ 2 — 41 ☐

8. Which of the methods of providing parents with information about their children's test performance listed just above are a good idea? Please go back over the list and mark in the space labeled "2" those methods which you think should be used in your school. Mark those which, if now used, you believe should be continued, and also those which, if not now used, you believe should be put into effect.

9. In talking with parents about their children, do you yourself discuss the results of standardized tests with them?

Frequently ____3 Rarely ____1
Sometimes ____2 Never ____0 — 43 ☐

10. Does your school provide students with information about their performance on standardized tests? (Exact scores need not be mentioned.)

Yes ____ 1 No ____ 0 Uncertain ____ 2 — 44 ☐

Please do not write in this margin

If your answer to question 10 is yes, which of the following best describes the procedure used? Please check the space marked "1" after every method that is used in your school. (Do not use the spaces marked "2" as yet.)

Teachers discuss test results with students when the occasion arises or the need occurs. This is largely at the discretion of the teacher. ___1 ___2 45 ☐

Counselors confer at certain times with students individually and discuss their test results in the context of the students' future plans. ___1 ___2 46 ☐

Students meet in groups, and an experienced teacher or counselor discusses test results and their meaning in general terms. ___1 ___2 47 ☐

Test results are given to the student for him to take home. ___1 ___2 48 ☐

11. Which of the methods of providing students with information about their test performance listed just above are a good idea? Please go back over the list and mark in the space labeled "2" those methods which you think should be used in your school. Mark those which, if now used, you believe should be continued, and also those which, if not now used, you believe should be put into effect.

12. In talking with students about their plans and problems, do you yourself discuss the results of standardized tests with them?

Frequently ___3 Rarely ___1 50
Sometimes ___2 Never ___0

13. Apart from the actual time you spend in the classroom, about how often do you take time out to gather information about students? (For example, looking up records, conferring with parents, consulting with the guidance counselor, etc.)

Approximately one hour per semester ___0 51
Approximately one hour per month ___1
Approximately one hour per week ___2
More than one hour per week ___3

Please do not write in this margin

14. How much time do you think you ought to spend in gathering information about students?

Approximately one hour per semester ___0
Approximately one hour per month ___1
Approximately one hour per week ___2
More than one hour per week ___3

52

15. About how many teachers in your school would you say make it a point to look up the test scores of students?

Almost all ___3
More than half ___2
Less than half ___1
Almost none ___0

53

16. In talking with other teachers about students, do you discuss the results of standardized tests with them?

Frequently ___3 Rarely ___1
Sometimes ___2 Never ___0

54

17. Here are three commonly held attitudes regarding a student's scores on standardized tests.

A. A test score is a valuable piece of information which answers many of the questions I have about my students.

B. A test score is a valuable piece of information useful in raising important questions in my mind about my students.

C. A test score is an interesting piece of technical information but possesses little or no value for the on-going activities of the classroom.

Of these attitudes, which one comes closest to the one you think teachers ought to hold?

Attitude A ___0 Attitude B ___1 Attitude C ___2

55 ☐

Please do
not write
in this
margin

18. If you had to make an important decision about a student--for example, advising him to enter or not to enter the college preparatory curriculum--how sure would you be of the correctness of your advise to him in each of the following cases?

a) You have never had the student in your class, but you have looked up his record and have found his intelligence and achievement test scores.

Very unsure about my advice ___0
Rather unsure ___1
Fairly sure ___2
Almost completely sure ___3

56 ☐

b) You have had the student in your class for one full year, but the student has not been given any intelligence or achievement tests.

Very unsure about my advice ___0
Rather unsure ___1
Fairly sure ___2
Almost completely sure ___3

57 ☐

c) You have had the student in your class for one full year, and you also know his intelligence and achievement test scores.

Very unsure about my advice ___0
Rather unsure ___1
Fairly sure ___2
Almost completely sure ___3

58 ☐

FOR TEACHERS AND ADMINISTRATORS ONLY

19. Of the students you referred to the counselor last year, (if any) approximately how many did you refer in each of the following areas? (If you referred a student for several reasons, consider only the most important category.)

Vocational: What field to enter following high school graduation. ____

Educational: What courses to take in high school; what curriculum to pursue. ____

College: Whether to prepare for college; what college to enter; what field to major in. ____

Academic: How to motivate student to do better classroom work. ____

Discipline: How to improve student's relationship with teachers and peers. ____

FOR COUNSELORS ONLY

19. Of the students referred to you last year, approximately how many were referred in each of the following areas? (If a student was referred to you for several reasons, consider only the most important category.)

Vocational: What field to enter following high school graduation. ____

Educational: What courses to take in high school; what curriculum to pursue. ____

College: Whether to prepare for college; what college to enter; what field to major in. ____

Academic: How to motivate student to do better classroom work. ____

Discipline: How to improve student's relationship with teachers and peers. ____

3

## Section II

### STUDENT PROBLEMS

Below are four problems of a type familiar to most teachers. Under each is a list of six kinds of information a teacher might want to obtain about the student if the teacher wished to help him with his problem. For each problem, please place a "1" after the kind of information you would most want to have about such a student. Then place a "2" after the kind of information you would next most want to have, and "3" after the third kind of information you would like to have. Please do this for each of the four problems.

### Problem 1

At the beginning of the school year the principal asks you whether, in your judgment, Marian Sanders should be placed in the eleventh grade accelerated science class, or in the regular science class taken by the majority of students. What three kinds of information, (in order) would you most like to have about this student?

Achievement in school subjects ____
Family and home life ____
Intelligence ____
Fears and worries ____
Interests and ambitions ____
Personality and character ____

Please do not write in this margin

59 ☐
60 ☐
61 ☐

### Problem 2

George Merwin is a transfer student new to the school this year. He was placed in the eleventh grade--as indicated by his transfer record--yet he is doing failing work in your class, and other teachers have told you that he is failing in theirs also. What three kinds of information would you most like to have about this student?

Achievement in school subjects ____
Family and home life ____
Intelligence ____
Fears and worries ____
Interests and ambitions ____
Personality and character ____

62 ☐
63 ☐
64 ☐

## Problem 3

Please do
not write
in this
margin

Kay Johnson is enrolled in the college preparatory curriculum but is doing below average and failing work in mathematics and science. Her parents come to school at frequent intervals to talk to the teachers of these subjects, but Kay's work shows no improvement. Kay is active in every kind of school dramatics and has recently signed up to try out for the lead in the high school play. When reminded that she was doing failing work in some of her classes she said she didn't care as long as she passed. What three kinds of information would you most like to have about this student?

Achievement in school subjects ____
Family and home life ____
Intelligence ____
Fears and worries ____
Interests and ambitions ____
Personality and character ____

65 ☐
66 ☐
67 ☐

## Problem 4

Andy Wilson causes trouble for every teacher who has him. His classroom behavior is disruptive. He is constantly doing small things like shooting paper-wads, blowing bubbles with his gum and allowing them to pop noisily, deliberately dropping his books on the floor, deliberately tripping himself when he goes to the pencil sharpener, etc. What three kinds of information would you most like to have about this student?

Achievement in school subjects ____
Family and home life ____
Intelligence ____
Fears and worries ____
Interests and ambitions ____
Personality and character ____

68 ☐
69 ☐
70 ☐

71 ☐
72 ☐
73 ☐
74 ☐
75 ☐

## Section III

## THE COUNSELING ROLE

Please do not write in this margin

If your school has NO counselor, either full-time or part-time, make an X here and return this booklet to us in the attached envelope. ☐

11 ☐

Beginning on the next page is a list of things a counselor in a school might do. Some of these things, of course, are things which would be appropriate for a counselor to do in one school but inappropriate for a counselor in another school.

Please tell us whether you personally believe a counselor in your school should be expected to do each of these things. The question here is not what the counselor is now assigned to do in your school. Rather, we need to know what things--in your judgment--ought to be included among the counselor's duties in your particular school.

If there is more than one counselor in your school and the counselors have different responsibilities, answer in terms of what you believe they should accomplish as a group.

The abbreviations for answers at the right of each item have the following meanings:

| | |
|---|---|
| Yes | Yes, this a thing which should be one of the duties of a counselor in my school. |
| No | No, this thing should not be one of the duties of a counselor in my school. |
| Unc | I am uncertain whether a counselor in my school ought to do this. I am not sure he should, and I am not sure he shouldn't. |

Please circle one answer for each item.

| | Duty or Responsibility | Appropriateness | Please do not write in this margin |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1. | Compile and arrange a file of selected information about students which is freely accessible to all teachers. | Yes<br>No<br>Unc | 11 |
| 2. | Make a study of test and other data and draw up a general report for the principal regarding the student body at large. | Yes<br>No<br>Unc | 12 |
| 3. | Invite teachers to group meetings to learn more about the interpretation of tests. | Yes<br>No<br>Unc | 14 |
| 4. | Notify all students that certain test data have been received and encourage them to come in for conferences regarding them. | Yes<br>No<br>Unc | 15 |
| 5. | Act as a first level of referral for disciplinary and truancy problems. | Yes<br>No<br>Unc | 16 |
| 6. | Advise on grouping students into ability levels and on routing them into various courses of study. (College preparatory, vocational, etc.) | Yes<br>No<br>Unc | 17 |
| 7. | Establish regular conferences with individual teachers to discuss actual student cases. | Yes<br>No<br>Unc | 18 |
| 8. | Conduct a study of student needs and use the results to plan the conduct of counseling services. | Yes<br>No<br>Unc | 20 |
| 9. | Explain to parents (when they ask) the general meaning of certain of their child's test results and confer with those who come in with problems concerning their children. | Yes<br>No<br>Unc | 24 |
| 10. | Conduct small faculty "case conferences" meetings on particular students in which test and other data are brought into proper perspective. | Yes<br>No<br>Unc | 25 |
| 11. | Be responsible for such things as re-admitting students after absences, transferring students to other schools, etc. | Yes<br>No<br>Unc | 28 |

| Duty or Responsibility | Appropriateness | Please do not write in this margin |
|---|---|---|
| 12. Conduct group meetings with students to discuss general questions of curriculum and course selection, and how test scores can help answer those questions. | Yes<br>No<br>Unc | 29 |
| 13. Teach at least one regular subject-matter class. (e.g., math, English, etc.) | Yes<br>No<br>Unc | 31 |
| 14. Assist staff members in deciding which students should be enrolled in certain courses (e.g., algebra vs. general math, chemistry vs. general science, etc.) | Yes<br>No<br>Unc | 33 |
| 15. Conduct large group meetings with parents (for example, at PTA) to explain and interpret test scores in general terms. | Yes<br>No<br>Unc | 34 |
| 16. Maintain the cumulative student record files. | Yes<br>No<br>Unc | 37 |
| 17. Act as a first level of referral for failing students. | Yes<br>No<br>Unc | 39 |
| 18. Set up a schedule of required conferences with all students regarding their test results. | Yes<br>No<br>Unc | 40 |
| 19. Conduct special classes in "careers", "group guidance", "marriage", etc. | Yes<br>No<br>Unc | 41 |
| 20. Conduct meetings scheduled by authority of the principal in which teachers can learn more about the techniques, purposes, and values of counseling. | Yes<br>No<br>Unc | 42 |
| 21. Assist teachers to build their own files for the students in their classes (or in their homerooms). | Yes<br>No<br>Unc | 43 |
| 22. Send written notice to all staff members that test data have been received and are available. | Yes<br>No<br>Unc | 48 |

| Duty or Responsibility | Appropri-ateness | Please do not write in this margin |
|---|---|---|
| 23. Have an extra-curricular club. | Yes<br>No<br>Unc | 51 |
| 24. Conduct meetings scheduled by authority of the principal in which teachers can learn more about the interpretation of tests. | Yes<br>No<br>Unc | 52 |
| 25. Confer with teachers regarding general problems of motivation, discipline, etc. | Yes<br>No<br>Unc | 54 |
| 26. Conduct general faculty planning meetings to discuss staff needs with regard to the kinds of tests that would be most useful. | Yes<br>No<br>Unc | 55 |
| 27. Make a study of test data and select particular parents to be called in for conference. | Yes<br>No<br>Unc | 56 |
| 28. Arrange for group tests to be scored by agencies outside the school. | Yes<br>No<br>Unc | 57 |
| 29. Conduct small group faculty meetings to discuss the interpretation and use of tests to help solve problems specific to that group (e.g., science department, language department, etc.) | Yes<br>No<br>Unc | 58 |
| 30. Counsel students regarding choice of high school courses, high school curricula, and possible vocations. | Yes<br>No<br>Unc | 60 |
| 31. Invite teachers to group meetings to learn more about the aims, techniques, and values of counseling. | Yes<br>No<br>Unc | 61 |
| 32. Conduct a general faculty briefing meeting after test data are received and discuss the results and possible uses in general terms. | Yes<br>No<br>Unc | 63 |
| 33. Make a study of test data and select particular students to be called in for conference. | Yes<br>No<br>Unc | 65 |

| Duty or Responsibility | Appropriateness | Please do not write in this margin |
|---|---|---|
| 34. Notify all parents that certain test results have been received and encourage them to come in for conferences. | Yes<br>No<br>Unc | 67 |
| 35. Hold small group faculty meetings to discuss the particular needs of various departments (such as Science, Industrial Arts, Language, etc.) in regard to the kinds of tests that would be most useful. | Yes<br>No<br>Unc | 71 |
| 36. Meet with students as a group and discuss their test results in general terms. | Yes<br>No<br>Unc | 76 |
| 37. Confer with individual teachers regarding the kinds of tests they might need in their own work. | Yes<br>No<br>Unc | 78 |
| 38. Counsel students regarding family and other types of emotional problems. | Yes<br>No<br>Unc | 79 |
| 39. Chaperone school dances, athletic events, etc. | Yes<br>No<br>Unc | 80 |